

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXXVI.]

APRIL, 1856.

[Vol. XII.

SAMUEL ROGERS.*

THE death of SAMUEL ROGERS, at the patriarchal age of 92 years, has severed one of the last links between the preceding and the present century. We may now seek in vain for one whose hand had raised the knocker at Bolt Court to ask for an interview with Dr. Johnson, or for one who had seen the last of the heads of the Lancashire rebels which remained, after a quarter of a century's exposure, "a black shapeless lump," upon a pole at Temple Bar. Equally vain would our inquiries be were we to seek for one who had witnessed Garrick's masterly portraiture of the man of pleasure in Ranger, the hero of Dr. Benjamin Hoadly's "Suspicious Husband;"† or for one who had heard Sir Joshua Reynolds deliver his last lecture at the Royal Academy, finishing those masterly lessons on Art with the charmed name of MICHAEL ANGELO.

It has seldom, we imagine, been the lot of a man of the middle rank of English society to know a greater number of distinguished persons than were known to Rogers. Of the men and women of the 18th and 19th centuries, in addition to those already mentioned, he knew Burke, Boswell, Price, Kemble, Siddons, Priestley, Kippis, Fox, Grenville, Barbault, Chantrey, Byron, Scott, Campbell, Moore, Lord Holland, the Duke of Wellington, and every greatly distinguished person of the present generation of English.

However quiet and free from stirring incidents the personal experience of such a man may have been, his biography cannot fail to interest its readers by the contrasts which its several portions will present, and by the varied character of his reminiscences of events and men. Scarcely, therefore, is this remarkable man entombed, before a swarm of articles and books respecting him make their appearance. We propose to gather from them, and from other less accessible sources, an outline of

* 1. The Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers. London—Moxon. 1848.

2. Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers. To which is added Porsoniana. Moxon. 1856.

3. Gentleman's Magazine, February, 1856.

† But for an attack by a fit of the mumps, Rogers would have been able to record his having seen Garrick in *Lear*.

his career, extracting as we proceed some illustrative anecdotes from Mr. Dyce's reminiscences of his "Table-Talk."

Samuel Rogers was born July 30, 1763, at Newington Green. The house is the first on the west side of the Green that is come to in walking from Ball's Pond. His father was Thomas Rogers, a member of a city banking firm. Although brought up a Churchman, Thomas Rogers soon after his marriage united himself to the Protestant Dissenters, and he not only remained in their communion to the close of life, but also manifested a strong interest in whatever affected their rights and well-being. He espoused with warmth the political and liberal predilections of his party. When the American war broke out, he shared in that disapprobation of it which Englishmen not the least patriotic expressed. When the news of the battle of Lexington reached this country, he put on mourning. To some one who asked him "if he had lost a friend," his reply was, "I have lost a great many—my friends in New England."

At the general election which took place in the autumn of 1780, and at which angry contests occurred in most parts of the kingdom, Mr. Thomas Rogers stood for Coventry, a borough long distinguished for its adherence to liberal politics. He was successful, after an obstinate struggle, on the poll, but was afterwards unsuccessful in defending his return against a petition.

On his mother's side, Samuel Rogers was descended from an honoured Puritan and Nonconformist stock, being the great-great-grandson of Philip Henry, the ejected minister of Worthenbury. Eleanor, his third daughter, married, Jan. 1, 1689, Mr. Samuel Radford, of Chester, one whom his brother-in-law, Matthew Henry, described as "an useful, good man, a blessing to his family." Mrs. Radford died in 1697, two years before her husband. On the death of the latter, four orphan children, the issue of this marriage, found in their uncle, the celebrated commentator, Matthew Henry, a kind protector. He took them into his house, administered their affairs with consummate prudence, educated them with such considerate care that, in the words of the biographer of the family, they "adorned Christianity." The eldest of these orphans, Daniel Radford, became a successful London warehouseman, and married Mary Harris, granddaughter to Dr. Coxe, physician to Queen Mary. The only issue of this marriage was Mary Radford, the mother of the poet Rogers. She lost her own mother when about three years old. In 1760, she married Thomas, the son of Thomas Rogers, of the Hill, near Stourbridge.

Seven children, four sons and three daughters, were the issue of this marriage. The eldest son, Daniel, settled at Wassel Grove, near Stourbridge, and died March 2, 1829. It was on the occasion of his death that Charles Lamb addressed some beautiful lines to his friend Rogers. Thomas, the second son,

died in early youth, and his memory is consecrated in those well-known lines in the second part of the "Pleasures of Memory:"

"Oft may the spirits of the dead descend
To watch the silent slumbers of a friend;
To hover round his evening walk unseen,
And hold sweet converse on the dusky green;
To hail the spot where first their friendship grew,
And heaven and nature opened to their view!
Oft, when he trims his cheerful hearth, and sees
A smiling circle emulous to please;
There may these gentle guests delight to dwell,
And bless the scene they loved in life so well.
Oh, thou! with whom my heart was wont to share
From Reason's dawn each pleasure and each care;
With whom, alas! I fondly hoped to know
The humble walks of happiness below;
If thy blest nature now unites above
An angel's pity with a brother's love,
Still o'er my love preserve thy mild control,
Correct my views and elevate my soul;
Grant me thy peace and purity of mind,
Devout yet cheerful, active yet resigned;
Grant me, like thee, whose heart knew no disguise,
Whose blameless wishes never aimed to rise,
To meet the changes Time and Chance present,
With modest dignity and calm content.
When thy last breath, ere Nature sunk to rest,
Thy meek submission to thy God expressed;
When thy last look, ere thought and feeling fled,
A mingled gleam of hope and triumph shed;
What to thy soul its glad assurance gave,
Its hope in death, its triumph o'er the grave?
The sweet remembrance of unblemished youth,
The still, inspiring voice of Innocence and Truth."

The third child, a daughter, Martha, married Mr. John Towgood, the banker, grandson of Rev. Micaiah Towgood, of Exeter, the author of "Dissent Justified."

The fourth child was Samuel Rogers, the poet. The fifth was a daughter, Sarah Rogers, who lived till the beginning of last year. The sixth child was a daughter, Maria, who married, in 1795, Mr. Sutton Sharpe. The eldest surviving member of this branch of the family is our valued correspondent, Mr. S. Sharpe, the author of the "History of Egypt." Mrs. Sharpe died in 1806, the year in which she gave birth to her youngest son. Long after, her virtues were commemorated in some verses on "Human Life:"

"Such grief was ours—it seems but yesterday—
When in thy prime, wishing so much to stay,
'Twas thine, Maria, thine without a sigh
At midnight in a sister's arms to die!

Oh! thou wert lovely—lovely was thy frame,
 And pure thy spirit as from Heaven it came!
 And, when recalled to join the blest above,
 Thou diedst a victim to exceeding love,
 Nursing the young to health. In happier hours,
 When idle fancy wove luxuriant flowers,
 Once in thy mirth thou bad'st me write on thee;
 And now I write—what thou shalt never see."

The youngest child of Thomas and Mary Rogers was a son, Henry, the banker, who died at Highbury Terrace in 1832.

It might well be believed, even if there were no testimony to the fact, that the mother of such a family was an amiable and highly-gifted woman. Samuel Rogers always described her as equally handsome and amiable, and as a person of great tenderness of feeling as well as of strong religious principle. She taught her children from their early infancy "to be tenderly kind towards the meanest living thing;" and so deep was the impression made by her early lessons of love on her gifted son, that he was careful of the life even of those insects of prey, gnats and wasps, against which most men and women wage unsparing war. The strong impression made upon him by his mother's lessons respecting mercy to the brute creation, probably had some influence in the conviction of his mature life, that in another state of existence compensation would be provided for their too frequent state of suffering on earth. Of his sense of maternal affection, Rogers more than once gave eloquent expression in his poems. Depth of feeling is not their general characteristic; but here the feeling *is* deep, and it is doubtless an utterance of the heart, warm with the recollection of the virtues of his own mother. Those lines in "Human Life" which describe the first offices of a mother in the religious education of her son, owe, we doubt not, something of their force and beauty to the poet's recollection of the holy and gentle influences under which his own childhood was passed.

"But soon a nobler task demands her care.
 Apart she joins his little hands in prayer,
 Telling of Him who sees in secret there.
 And now the volume on her knee has caught
 His wandering eye—now many a written thought
 Never to die, with many a lisping sweet,
 His moving, murmuring lips endeavour to repeat."

And when, illustrating another passage in the same poem which describes the vigils of a mother's love in the sick room of her child, he writes—"We may have many friends in life, but we can only have one mother,—'a discovery,' says Gray, 'which I never made till it was too late.' The child is no sooner born than he clings to his mother, nor, while she lives, is her image absent from him in the hour of his distress."

It has been already intimated that his mother was by principle and habit a Dissenter. Near her husband's house stood a meeting-house of the English Presbyterians; it is still to be seen, little altered in its outward appearance from that day, save that two elm-trees which stand directly before it have now grown to the dimensions and beauty which age alone can give to trees. Here a long succession of good men have ministered.* When Samuel Rogers was taken as a boy to the meeting-house where his parents worshiped, the services were conducted by two ministers. The morning preacher was Dr. Thomas Amory, a solid and able divine, well versed in literature as well as theology, and who in early life at least had cultivated the muse. The successor of Dr. Amory as morning preacher at Newington Green was Dr. Joseph Towers, a voluminous author of works on politics, literature, biography and religion, and a coadjutor of Dr. Kippis in the *Biographia Britannica*. The afternoon preacher was Dr. Price, whose ministrations in the pulpit, and whose delightful conversation in society, made an ineffaceable impression on his boyish hearer. He lived close to the Rogers' family. His morning hours were devoted to study, but many of his evenings were passed amongst his flock, and in this easy social intercourse he assuaged the anxieties occasioned by his own feeble health and the long-continued sufferings of a beloved wife. The house of this good man at Newington Green was visited by persons whose friendship would of itself have conferred fame,—Mrs. Montague, Dr. Franklin, David Hume, Lord Shelburne, Lord Lyttelton, John Howard, Dr. Adams and Mrs. Chapone. It has sometimes been alleged that Dr. Price was not popular as a preacher. Those who have conversed with persons whose privilege it was to hear him habitually, have heard testimonies to the fascinations of his voice, manner and instructive matter. On this subject the testimony of Mr. Rogers is decisive.

“In my boyhood, my father one day called me and my brothers into

* Newington Green was an early and favourite haunt of Nonconformity. Its retiredness, combined with its vicinity to the Metropolis, made it the resort of some of those high-minded confessors of whom the world was not worthy. Here, a century before our poet was born, Morton taught, till persecution drove him across the Atlantic, and Defoe learnt. In the same academy studied a young divine, and perhaps at the same time as Defoe, one Timothy *Cruso*, whose surname the former has in his matchless fiction immortalized. Amongst the early ministers of Newington-Green chapel were William Wickins and Mr. Starkey, both ejected ministers. Mr. Joseph Bennett and Mr. John Russell succeeded them. Then Mr. Biscoe, a scholar and a man of great ability. He conformed, and obtained Church preferment in London, and a Royal Chaplaincy to George II. A more enduring monument of his reputation was the Boyle Lectures on the History of the Acts of the Apostles, a valuable book, recently reprinted at Oxford. Hugh Worthington, afterwards of Leicester, was one of the ministers of Newington Green. It may hereafter be a not unacceptable labour to collect the widely-scattered fragments of the biography of the succession of Newington-Green ministers.

his room, and asked us each what professions we wished to follow. When my turn came, I said (to my father's annoyance) that I should like 'to be a preacher;' for it was then the height of my ambition to figure in a pulpit;—I thought there was nothing on earth so *grand*. This predilection, I believe, was occasioned chiefly by the admiration I felt for Dr. Price and for his preaching. He was our neighbour (at Newington Green), and would often drop in, to spend the evening with us, in his dressing-gown: he would talk, and read the Bible, to us, till he sent us to bed in a frame of mind as heavenly as his own. He lived much in the society of Lord Lansdowne and other people of rank; and his manners were extremely polished. In the pulpit he was great indeed,—making his hearers forget the *preacher* and think only of the *subject*. The passage 'On Virtue,' cited from Price in Enfield's *Speaker*, is a very favourite one with me, though probably it is quite unknown to readers of the present day."—Pp. 3, 4.

"Fitzpatrick, who had been much in the company of David Hume, used always to speak of him as 'a delicious creature.'

"Hume told Cadell the bookseller that he had a great desire to be introduced to as many of the persons who had written against him as could be collected; and requested Cadell to bring him and them together. Accordingly, Dr. Douglas, Dr. Adams, &c. &c., were invited by Cadell to dine at his house in order to meet Hume. They came: and Dr. Price, who was of the party, assured me that they were all delighted with David."—P. 107.

"I have seen Howard the Philanthropist more than once; he was a remarkably mild-looking man. His book on Prisons is excellently written. People are not aware that Dr. Price wrote a portion of it."—Pp. 151, 152.

The only schoolmaster whose name is given as an instructor of Samuel Rogers was the Rev. James Pickbourn. This gentleman, after exercising the ministry amongst the Protestant Dissenters in the counties of Norfolk and Essex, undertook the librarianship at Dr. Williams's, and, after attending some young gentlemen in foreign travel, opened a school in Grove Street, Hackney, which he conducted with much credit for more than twenty-seven years. Rogers would be in his fourteenth year at the time of his entrance on Mr. Pickbourn's school. Here he not only acquired knowledge, but laid the foundation of some enduring friendships. His master was the author of two dissertations, one on "the English Verb," the other on "Metrical Pauses." In religious sentiment he was an Unitarian. The intimate associates of the family of Rogers seem to have been Unitarian. Of Dr. Priestley his recollections were always interesting and cordial.

"Dr. Priestley went to Paris in company with Lord Shelburne;* and he assured me that all the eminent Frenchmen whom he met there were entirely destitute of any religious belief,—sheer atheists. At a large

* "Afterwards Marquis of Lansdowne,—to whom, nominally, Priestley acted as librarian, but really as his literary companion. It was in 1774 that they made a tour to the Continent.

dinner-party he asked his next neighbour, 'Who is that gentleman?' The answer was, 'It is ——; and he believes no more *than you and I do.*'—Marmontel used to read some of his unpublished works to parties of his friends, on certain days, at his own house. Priestley, who attended a few of those readings, declared that Marmontel occasionally gesticulated with such violence, that it was necessary to keep out of the reach of his arms for fear of being knocked down.

"I was intimately acquainted with Dr. Priestley; and a more amiable man never lived; he was all gentleness, kindness, and humility. He was once dining with me, when some one asked him (rather rudely) 'how many books he had published?' He replied, 'Many more, sir, than I should like to read.' Before going to America, he paid me a visit, passing a night at my house. He left England chiefly in compliance with the wishes of his wife."—Pp. 121, 122.

Mr. Maltby, the friend of Rogers, also had his reminiscences of Priestley, and one of them is recorded by Mr. Dyce in the "Porsoniana" appended to the "Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers."

"I once dined at Dilly's with Parr, Priestley, Cumberland, and some other distinguished people. Cumberland, who belonged to the family of the Blandishes, bepraised Priestley to his face, and after he had left the party, spoke of him very disparagingly. This excited Parr's extremest wrath. When I met him a few days after, he said, 'Only think of Mr. Cumberland! that he should have presumed to talk *before me*,—*before me, sir*,—in such terms of *my* friend Dr. Priestley! Pray, sir, let Mr. Dilly know my opinion of Mr. Cumberland,—that his ignorance is equalled only by his impertinence, and that both are exceeded by his malice.'—Parr hated Dr. Horsley to such a degree that he never mentioned him by any other name than *the fiend*."—Porsoniana, pp. 314, 315.

When Boswell, in his Life of Dr. Johnson, gave a prejudiced and incorrect account of an interview with Priestley, Rogers, who had talked with the latter on the subject of his conversation with Johnson, came forward in the Gentleman's Magazine, in conjunction with Dr. Parr, to state the true facts of the case. The subject has been recently (C. R. IX. 171—175) discussed in our pages, but it may now be desirable to give Mr. Rogers's letter to Dr. Parr, as it appeared in the Gentleman's Magazine for March, 1795.

"Newington Green, Feb. 23.

"Dear Sir,—I can answer your several questions distinctly. I heard of the interview between Dr. Johnson and Dr. Priestley, from Dr. Priestley himself.

"I have heard it mentioned more than once. I understood that it was *not* solicited by Dr. Priestley; and that, if any overture was made for that purpose, it came from Dr. Johnson.

"I found that Dr. Priestley thought Dr. Johnson's behaviour such as it ought to have been from one man of letters to another. Johnson was very civil.

"I hope that I have written satisfactorily; and am happy in the opportunity which you have given to me of assuring you with what respect I am, dear Sir, your most obedient servant,

SAMUEL ROGERS."

Of Rogers's boyish days, so happily passed at Newington Green and at Hackney at Mr. Pickbourn's school, we have one or two reminiscences in the Table-Talk.

"In my childhood, after doing any thing wrong, I used always to feel miserable from a consciousness of having done it: my parents were quite aware of this, and therefore seldom reproved me for a fault,—leaving me to reprove myself.

"When I was about thirteen, my father and mother gave a great children's ball, at which many grown-up folks were also present. I was dancing a minuet with a pretty little girl; and at the moment when I ought to have put on my hat and given both hands to my partner, I threw the hat among the young ladies who were sitting on benches, and so produced great surprise and confusion in the room. This strange feat was occasioned by my suddenly recollecting a story of some gallant youth who had signalled himself in the same way."—Pp. 2, 3.

To realize the frolicsome antic of the youthful Rogers, we must remember the solemn Grandisonian character of the dance and the costume of the age, from the cocked hat to the breeches and clocked silk stockings.

"When I was a school-boy, I wore, like other school-boys, a cocked hat;—we used to run about the fields, chasing butterflies, in cocked hats. After growing up, I have walked through St. Paul's Churchyard in a cocked hat."—P. 7.

When the recollections of a contemporary of our own reach back to the age of hoops and cocked hats, we can scarcely wonder that those of the aged men of the last century with whom Rogers talked in his youth took in the time when snipes were shot in what is now Conduit Street, and when the Mall was crowded with ladies with their heads in full dress, and the gentlemen carrying their hats under their arms. In their hardy gallantry, the beaux of that age were insensible to catarrhs and colds! The fairer sex paid to fashion penalties still more costly.

"The head-dresses of the ladies, during my youth, were of a truly preposterous size. I have gone to Ranelagh in a coach with a lady who was obliged to sit upon a stool placed in the bottom of the coach, the height of her head-dress not allowing her to occupy the regular seat.

"Their tight lacing was equally absurd. Lady Crewe told me, that, on returning home from Ranelagh, she has rushed up to her bed-room, and desired her maid to cut her laces without a moment's delay, for fear she should faint."—Pp. 22, 23.

It was at the school of Mr. Pickbourn that Rogers formed a friendship which he was permitted to enjoy without interruption for about eighty years,—a circumstance which is perhaps without a parallel in literary history; for how rare must be the incident of two men of the same age extending their pilgrimage to between four and five-score years, and still more rare the endurance of that brittle thing, Friendship, through the rough wear and tear of a long life, and all the changes of position and opi-

nion, often sickening to the heart, which they who survive to mingle with a *third* generation are doomed to behold!

Unlike his friend, Mr. Maltby, after leaving the school at Grove Street, went to Cambridge, where, however, he did not take a degree,—subscription to the Articles being, we presume, the only bar. He practised as a solicitor in London, but was too fond of literature to win the smiles of a mistress so jealous and exclusive as Law. He was a fair classic, and for twenty years the intimate friend of Porson. With Italian literature he was well versed; still more so with the literature of France and England. In the department of bibliography, his knowledge was extensive and accurate. The only use to which he turned his far-sought and curious learning, besides adorning with it the society of his friends, was as principal Librarian of the London Institution, an office to which he succeeded on the death of Porson, and the duties of which he continued to discharge till the year 1834. He was then superannuated, but continued to occupy apartments at the Institution, where, until his death in 1854, he was constantly visited by Rogers.

“My friend Maltby and I, when we were very young men, had a strong desire to see Dr. Johnson; and we determined to call upon him and introduce ourselves. We accordingly proceeded to his house in Bolt Court; and I had my hand on the knocker, when our courage failed us, and we retreated. Many years afterwards, I mentioned this circumstance to Boswell, who said, ‘What a pity that you did not go boldly in! he would have received you with all kindness.’

“Dr. Johnson said to an acquaintance of mine, ‘My other works are wine and water; but my *Rambler* is pure wine.’ The world now thinks differently.”—Pp. 9, 10.

As Johnson died in 1784, this visit of Rogers to Bolt Court must have been prior to the publication of any of his works; and chronology disproves the story, alluded to in some of the biographical sketches now current, of his having left an early poem at Dr. Johnson’s door a few days before the Doctor’s death. To this period (i. e. before 1790, when Wilkes retired from Parliament) another of the reminiscences belongs.

“One morning, when I was a lad, Wilkes came into our banking-house to solicit my father’s vote. My father happened to be out; and I, as his representative, spoke to Wilkes. At parting, Wilkes shook hands with me; and I felt proud of it for a week after.

“He was quite as ugly, and squinted as much, as his portraits make him; but he was very gentlemanly in appearance and manners. I think I see him at this moment, walking through the crowded streets of the city, as Chamberlain, on his way to Guildhall, in a scarlet coat, military boots, and a bag-wig,—the hackney-coachman in vain calling out to him, ‘A coach, your honour!’” —Pp. 42, 43.

In 1791, Mr. Rogers accidentally caught a hasty sight of the corpse of John Wesley. The story is told far better by Mr.

Mitford, in a recent letter to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, than in the *Table-Talk*; and we may here observe, in passing, that the impression exists among some of the friends of Mr. Rogers, that Mr. Dyce's version of the *Table-Talk* is often bald, and below the habitual mark of Rogers's point and wit.

"The last drive I ever took with Mr. Rogers in his chariot, was one often previously made by us into the city, to pay one of his regular calls on his oldest friend, Mr. William Maltby, of the London Institution, who had been his schoolfellow more than eighty years previous to this time, and who died a year or two before him, nearly at the same age. In returning by the City Road, he pulled the check-string opposite to the Bunhill-Fields burial-ground, and then desired me to get out and read the inscription on the stone which stands conspicuously over the grave of the well-known Thomas Hardy. This being done, he said, 'You see that little chapel opposite; go and look carefully at the house which stands there to the left of it, and then come back and get in.' This all duly performed, and again seated side by side, he said, 'When I was a young man in the banking-house and my father lived at Newington, I used every day in going to the city to pass by this place. One day, in returning, I saw a number of respectable persons of both sexes assembled here, all well dressed in mourning, and with very serious look and behaviour. The door of the house was open, and they entered it in pairs. I thought that, without impropriety, I might join them, so we all walked up stairs, and came to a drawing-room, in the midst of which was a table; on this table lay the body of a person dressed in a clergyman's robes, with bands, and his grey hair shading his face on either side. He was of small stature, and his countenance looked like wax. We all moved round the table, some of the party much affected, with our eyes fixed upon the venerable figure that lay before us; and, as we moved on, others came up and succeeded in like manner. After we had gone the round of the table in our lingering procession, we descended as we came. The person that lay before us was *the celebrated John Wesley*, and at the earnest request of his congregation, they were permitted to take this pathetic and affectionate farewell of their beloved pastor.'"—*Gentleman's Magazine*.

Samuel Rogers had not the benefit of an university training, nor even the advantages to be obtained in one of the Nonconformist academies in which university learning was taught. He had, however, the benefit of travel both in Great Britain and on the continent. Just before the French Revolution broke out, he visited Paris and went to court, where he saw Marie Antoinette dance a minuet. His companion on this journey was Mr. Boddington. They were the occasional guests of Lafayette, and met at his table some of the distinguished men with whose blood the revolutionary guillotine was afterwards drenched.

Another journey, which produced still more interesting recollections, was to Edinburgh. He was furnished by Dr. Kippis, who appears to have been to him a valuable literary friend, with an introduction to Adam Smith, Robertson, and the other lights of the University of the Scottish capital.

"I found him (Adam Smith) very kind and communicative. He was (what Robertson was not) a man who had seen a great deal of the world. Once, in the course of conversation, I happened to remark of some writer, that 'he was rather superficial,—a Voltaire.'—'Sir,' cried Smith, striking the table with his hand, 'there has been but *one* Voltaire!'

"Robertson, too, was very kind to me. He, one morning, spread out the map of Scotland on the floor, and got upon his knees, to describe the route I ought to follow in making a tour on horseback through the Highlands.

"At Edinburgh I became acquainted with Henry Mackenzie, who asked me to correspond with him; which I (then young, romantic, and an admirer of his *Julia de Roubigné*) willingly agreed to. We accordingly wrote to each other occasionally during several years; but his letters, to my surprise and disappointment, were of the most commonplace description. Yet his published writings display no ordinary talent; and, like those of Beattie, they are remarkable for a pure English idiom,—which cannot be said of Hume's writings, beautiful as *they* are.

"The most memorable day perhaps which I ever passed was at Edinburgh,—a Sunday; when, after breakfasting with Robertson, I heard him preach in the forenoon, and Blair in the afternoon, then took coffee with the Piozzis, and supped with Adam Smith. Robertson's sermon was excellent both for matter and manner of delivery. Blair's was good, but less impressive; and his broad Scotch accent offended my ears greatly."—Pp. 44—46.

He neglected to visit Burns, although he was within thirty miles of Dumfries, where Burns then lived. The literati of Edinburgh had at that time little appreciation of the Ayrshire poet. Afterwards, when Rogers knew how to value the poetry of Burns (the *Cottar's Saturday Night* he pronounced "the finest pastoral in any language"), he greatly regretted not having sought him out.

(To be concluded in the next No.)

DIFFERENCE OF OPINION.

It is a fine remark of Rousseau's, that the best of us differ from others in fewer particulars than we agree with them in. The difference between a tall and a short man is only a few inches, whereas they are both several feet high. So a wise or learned man knows many things, of which the vulgar are ignorant; but there is a still greater number of things, the knowledge of which they share in common with him.—*Hazlitt.*

THOUGHTS ON SECULAR ATHEISM.*

CHAPTER VI.

GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD BY GENERAL LAWS.

THE regularity and uniformity of the operations of Nature are conspicuous on all hands, and strike every thinking mind. The heavenly bodies fulfil their mighty movements with silent constancy. The alternations of day and night, the succession of the moon's phases, the recurrence of the seasons in their stated annual round, are phenomena which, when regarded even without the aid of an advanced science as respects their causes, strikingly impress the mind with a sense of their stability and order; which is the more warranted the more thoroughly we investigate the laws that regulate them.

The phenomena which the earth exhibits for our nearer and more minute inspection, excite similar reflections on the constancy with which they are guided. How every substance retains its peculiar and distinctive properties, or modifies or loses them only according to clearly marked laws;—how each vegetable structure possesses its appropriate arrangement and organization, and has “its seed within itself” to reproduce its like;—how all animated beings fill their respective places in the great scale of existence;—how nature blossoms, bears fruit, and is renewed;—how various realms produce their varied stores;—how the animal and vegetable kingdoms minister to each other, and the gaseous connects the mystic circle;—these and similar observations without number, filling all books of physical science and natural history, and perpetually extending as the range of accurate scientific knowledge is enlarged,—more and more strikingly attest the uniformity of Nature. The Theist sees the faithfulness of God in this constancy of his works:

“For ever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven.

Thy faithfulness is unto all generations; Thou hast established the earth and it abideth.

They continue this day according to thine ordinance:

For all are thy servants.”

The government of the world is exercised according to general and undeviating laws. This is admitted on all hands; for the rare exceptional case of miracle seems rather the introduction of special powers than the suspension of ordinary ones, and does not at all affect the question between the Theist and the Atheist. That this government by general laws is indicative of Wisdom and Benevolence, is the topic of our present chapter.

When the philosophical Theist or the philosophical Christian speaks of the providence of God as “in all and through all and over all His works,” he does not mean to assert that we can see

* Continued from p. 106.

or feel or recognize any divine agency distinct from the properties and powers of Nature. Those powers and properties are themselves, in his view, the manifestations of providence. We perceive God's operations *in* them; not separate from, or super-added to, them. We trace His will and attributes as these things illustrate them. When Christ said, "No man hath seen God at any time," he spoke a truth to which every thoughtful inquirer into God's works responds. There is no visible hand stretched out to guide them. There is no voice heard proclaiming the mandate which they unresistingly obey. And when we speak of the "hand of God" as conducting them, and his "commands" as being the law to obedient worlds, we are sensible that we employ figurative expressions so strong as to be quite incorrect in a philosophical sense, though the very nature of human language, when applied to the subject of Deity, makes them necessary, and their figurative use is intelligible and pertinent enough. God is known by his works. The things that are made declare his eternal power and godhead. He acts by instrumental causes. He supplies all the energies which pervade the universe. We learn what He is, only by what He does. And we believe that *He* virtually does all that the course of Nature exhibits to us, because those exhibitions evince intelligence as well as power incomparably beyond what any of the beings we see, possess; and because even those beings who possess the greatest amount of intelligence and power have not intelligence to comprehend even their own structure in all its parts, nor have the vestige of power to create or sustain any of the energies of nature. All the properties and powers of such beings, therefore, are evidently not original, but imparted; and all the properties and powers of dependent beings we regard as so many modes of the Divine operation, and their continued activity as the evidence of the ceaseless agency of God. His providence, in respect to such and such a creature, is not to be conceived of as acting independently of, and separate from, its natural constitution and the other parts of nature with which it stands connected. Providence, to that being, *is* its own nature, capacities and powers, continually preserved and renewed. Providence *is* the adaptation of other things and beings round it to its nature and wants, and the reciprocal adaptation of its powers to the wants and the well-being of other parts of the great whole. Providence is the continued agency of all the powers of the world and its living creatures. Any idea of Providence which regards its functions as supplemental to these natural powers and faculties, or as coercive of them, may perplex, but cannot help to solve, the great problems of the universe.

Now, it is found by the diligent student of Nature, that its various and complex phenomena take place according to certain fixed principles, of comprehensive, or universal, application,

which are designated the General Laws of Nature. Providence, ever acting through the agency of created things, preserves (with rarest exceptions) an exact uniformity of operation. The same powers are continually upheld in the same departments of nature, while its different departments exhibit an endless diversity of powers, each permanent in its place. Thus the law (as it is called) of Gravitation, by which a stone falls to the ground, and planets are guided in their courses, is an unvarying and seemingly a universal principle in the material creation. It operates on atoms and on worlds,—at distances the most vast and the most minute. But in all circumstances, and at all times, it acts precisely in the same proportion of power to distance and to mass; —“*directly as the mass, inversely as the squares of the distances.*”

“That very Law which moulds a tear
And bids it trickle from its source,
That Law preserves the Earth a sphere,
And guides the Planets in their course.”

We do not know what Gravitation *is*. We may theorize upon it if we choose. We may call it a property of bodies, and decline contemplating it abstractedly, as in itself. Or we may call it a Force, by way of evading metaphysical difficulties with a harmless truism; or we may call it a Law, thereby describing its regularity of action and hinting its source in Mind. We may imagine it as a separate substance, if we can. We may personify it as a conscious executive power, if we choose. We may imagine it (as we often probably do) as a sort of delegated agent, destitute indeed of option, but commissioned with power. But all that we really know of it is, as a mode of operation, an order of sequence in phenomena. That mode of operation is uniform. The sequence of those phenomena is constant. And it is so with all other laws, or modes of operation, in Nature.

The laws of Light—of its radiation, transmission, reflection, refraction—are regular and uniform. The same body, under the same circumstances, is not luminous to-day and dark to-morrow. The same preparation of materials does not produce one colour at one time and another at another time. And so on.

The laws of Sound are equally fixed and permanent. The tone and intensity of any sound produced, its harmony or discord with another sound, are not matters of casualty, but arise from the specific arrangement of the parts of bodies; and while that arrangement continues the same, the phenomena are the same.

Things change only according to law. All those material agents, whether acting mechanically or chemically, which produce perpetual changes in the constitution or properties of other bodies, effect such changes according to regular and undeviating principles. Science shews this more and more. She knows nothing that is lawless in the wide realms already explored. She believes in nothing lawless in any new realm into which she is

continually adventuring. This is what is meant by the general laws of Nature or of Providence.

Why are the laws of Nature thus uniform? the mind necessarily asks. Is it through chance, or necessity? or is it through design? Is it a happy chance, if by chance? is it a blessed necessity, if through necessity? is it a wise and kind design, if design it be,—that has ordained the uniformity of Nature? Is it beneficial to man? Is it appropriate to the use and development of his faculties as a rational and moral being? Is it such an arrangement as a wise and good Creator (if such there be) may be conceived to have made for His creatures' sake? Let us consider well how important, how essential, this uniformity of Nature is in every aspect of human life.

In one word, it lies at the foundation of all our knowledge, experience and expectation. Its advantages to us are woven up with everything we do and purpose, from least to greatest. How could we act with rational choice and purpose, in the simplest and commonest circumstances, unless the laws of Nature were uniform? If the sun, for instance, should sometimes shine without giving heat, or burn without lighting us, or sometimes lose both light and heat for a year or two? Or if the earth, without any change of causes from which in their gradual progress we might learn experience, and to which we might apply partial alleviations, should withhold its increase;—if the tree should cease to be known by its fruits, and from the bramble-bush men should sometimes gather grapes and find the fig-tree yielding thistles? Or if heavy bodies should ascend and light ones fall? If the solid rock should every now and then become all at once fluid under our feet, and the ocean become a solid mass; and all things, wet and dry, hot and cold, hard and soft, vegetable and mineral, be changing their most characteristic properties at random perpetually? It is difficult to realize such a state of things as the total absence of law. Who could act? Who could confide? Who could exercise forethought to any purpose? Who could rationally hope? The husbandman would not know when to sow his seed, if the seasons might, according to his past observation, reverse their order to-morrow, the earth turning back in its orbit and winter arriving just when his crops were looking for the summer's sun. The artisan would not know how to labour, if his materials could change from wood to iron at once, or his tools change their make and substance, or if his fabric when made could have no security of retaining its texture, form, size and adaptation to its designed purpose. Who then should dare to navigate the ocean, if the position of the sun and stars changed at random,—if the compass obeyed no law or limit in what is termed its variation,—if the port of his destination itself had no settled bearings, but might be ever moving about (like the island in Grecian fable), floating and wandering amid the world of

waters, now above their surface and now below? These very simple and obvious and startling thoughts supply, in the Theist's view, if not the final cause of the uniformity of Nature's laws, yet at least abundant reason for human satisfaction and gratitude that the course of Nature is, as it is, stable and regular. Man is thus enabled to act, to foresee, to reason, to decide. The world is a fit place for him as "a being of large discourse looking before and after." His rational and moral powers have free scope.

It is true that suffering and disaster often occur under this uniformity of the laws of Nature. The mighty mechanism is not relaxed at the cry of individual need. Fire does not lose its power to burn, if through accident, or carelessness on my part, or mischievous design on that of some one else, my hand be exposed to it. If I fall into deep water and cannot swim, and no help be near, I must be drowned. A building inadequately constructed, or dilapidated by age, may fall, according to the mechanical laws of matter; and human life may, perhaps, be sacrificed in the ruin. Powerful and rapid machinery may mutilate or destroy whatever is inadvertently or wilfully placed within the range of its movements. Railway accidents the most terrific may result from the uniform operation of the laws of matter and motion, under circumstances of neglect or insufficient arrangement and foresight. In all these cases, Providence goes on acting still by the general laws wisely assigned to each portion of matter. God does not interpose, or intermit rather, for the special benefit of the particular creature liable to fall a prey to the ordinary action of the usefully-ordained law. And sometimes we may feel awe-struck at the harsh inflections of these stern mechanical laws, behind which the Creator withdraws (as it were) and hides himself from our view and (as regards these material results) from our prayers. We feel the perplexity of Job, whether we share his faith also or not:

"Behold, I go forward, but He is not there!
 And backward; but I cannot perceive Him;
 On the left hand where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him;
 He hideth Himself on the right hand that I cannot see Him.
 But He knoweth the way that I take;
 When He hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold."

Incomparably greater evil would, however, result from the want of law and regularity. And here the very nature of the human faculties, to the development of which, as we have seen, this regularity of Nature is all-important, provides the most appropriate protection and defence. A higher law, or principle, comes into operation, not to control the material agents, but to regulate human action in reference to them;—the *Law of Intelligence*,—the power of understanding and observing those operations of the material world which take place in a regular and reliable manner. By knowing their laws (which he could not

know if they were not uniform), man may command their operation for his benefit, and keep out of their reach where it would be hurtful. They are giants in his service, acting with the precision of nicest art. Their uniformity constitutes at once his power to use them and his safety against them. He must place before them the work to be done, and beware of leaving in their way work that their known action would mar. They are "excellent servants, bad masters." The knowledge of their operation is his power and his safety. Ignorance or inattention involves him in ruin at their hands.

Perhaps it may be felt as a difficulty, in respect to some of these general laws of the Divine government, that they cause the allotment of outward sources of happiness and misfortune to be made with little or no reference to the moral deserts of the individuals. True; the sun shines on the evil as well as on the good. The rain does not pass by the field of the wicked to fructify that of the righteous. But then, it is not the object of these material laws to dispense moral retribution. Their uniformity contemplates mental developement and moral discipline; the purpose of moral *recompence* may be fulfilled by *other* laws in us or about us, but not by these. And yet it does not by any means follow, from the merely external operation of certain laws in dispensing certain blessings, that the blessings so dispensed produce equal happiness to all on whom they fall. The good and the bad may find the same blessing different in its use and enjoyment. The prosperity of the wicked may be less sweet than the clear conscience of the poor. For there are certain other general laws of God's government connecting man with the outward world, both as recipient and as agent, which act as plainly as any merely material law, in connecting moral right and wrong to a certain extent with outward good and evil. A great part of man's lot is connected with his voluntary conduct in matters that belong to morals; so that industry, sobriety and prudence, have, to a certain extent, their natural outward reward; and the want of such virtues brings, to that same extent, its own accumulation of outward evils. Then there are other general laws in our moral nature, more refined in their operation, but not less inwrought into the constitution of things, by which all virtue is its own high reward, and all vice is its own dread punishment. There is in the one a self-approving and self-perpetuating principle, and in the other a principle of self-infliction and self-correction. Could we see into the coming world, these general laws of our moral nature would doubtless be more clear, in its further maturity and when exempted from the present influences of sensation. Taking the assertion of revelation, that there is another life of happiness and of woe apportioned equitably to human virtue and vice, we see enough to know that this general law of man's moral nature is dispensing and will dispense good

and evil with righteous discrimination, and that the essential equity of these awards is not impeached by the present operation of other general laws in the world of matter, by which outward good and evil are (for other purposes than those of recompence) distributed with little or no regard to human character.

Strange to say, the government of the world by general laws seems to induce in some minds a forgetfulness, if not a doubt, whether it is, properly speaking, *governed* at all. Because the Supreme Power acts, or at least His agency is manifested to us, only through the instrumentality of second causes, and because it is the principal business of Philosophy to investigate the nature and influence of second causes (while it might be understood, without momentary repetition, that it is as secondary causes that they are explored, leaving open the investigation of the Primary Cause, if not rather pointing to it),—it does so happen that many speak of the Laws of Nature and the elementary principles of bodies, as if these were the ultimate agents in their own causation; and some few have (as we have seen in the first chapter) attempted to elaborate philosophical systems of the universe without reference to the power of Deity in creating and upholding.

But what do we really mean, all this time, by a Law of Nature? What do we mean by a Law of any kind? Is it not simply a *rule* of action,—a prescribed mode of operation? Is the Law itself an intelligent, acting being? Does any Law devise itself and enact itself? Or does not a Law imply a legislator for its origination, and require an executive for its enforcement? The British statute laws, it is certain, did not exist till framed by Acts of Parliament; and it is equally certain that when any such law has passed both Houses of Parliament and received the Royal assent, it would not *enact itself* if the officers of civil justice did not carry it into effect. There are indeed some such laws, which, for want of due provision for their executive fulfilment, are a mere dead letter. Law is not self-moving. And if there be any such analogy of meaning as to justify the figurative appropriation of the same language to the principles on which the world is governed, then we demand to know whether it can be seriously maintained that the Law of Gravitation could have devised itself without a creative intelligence, or could perpetually enact itself throughout the material universe without an intelligent Providence. If any intelligible idea is suggested by the customary and useful and expressive term, *Laws of Nature*, it must be one which implies the glorious truth of a Supreme creative and presiding Intelligence as the fount of Law and Order.

But, not to dwell on the suggestive import of the term itself,—this principle, or law, of Gravitation is either intelligent and self-existent, or it is not. It is either ultimate in our philoso-

phy, and originative in the order of things, or it is not. It is either the First Cause, possessed of attributes sufficient to be the First Cause, or it is not. If it is thus self-existent and intelligent, all-devising and all-origivative, then this principle is God. For this is what we mean by God: the ultimate, the self-existent, intelligent and powerful, the all-sufficient Cause of what is,—upon which our minds are forced to retreat, and beyond which they cannot and need not go for any simpler solution. If such be the philosopher's belief respecting Gravitation, Gravitation to his mind is God. And every other law or principle or elementary substance in Nature must, if self-existent and self-sustaining, be in like manner divine. And then, instead of there being no Creator or no Providence, there are Gods many and Lords many who have made and still preside. But if Gravitation and the rest be not intelligent and self-existent, then we must ascribe the intelligence which they bespeak and the self-existence which preceded all derived being to some Higher Cause distinct from these minor agents; and that cause of all we adore as God.

Somewhere the First Agency is,—somewhere a directing Mind. And that Mind whose attributes the universe proclaims, that Agency whose laws guide the universe, is God. Let us not dogmatise respecting his nature or essence. Much has been debated far from wisely, if always reverently, by theologians, about the Divine substance, person, and other scholastic subtleties which have at least no necessary connection with the broad general argument now before us. We cannot find out the Almighty to perfection. His works we can trace only in part; how much less Him who shrouds Himself amid their mystery and wonder! Just in proportion as we are enabled to investigate some of the wonders of the creation, as we become better acquainted with its curious laws and secret processes and more and more subtle elements,—when we find ourselves approaching the limits of our power of observation, and tread the first steps in the maze of theory,—we are the more prepared to recognize the mystic symbols of the Great Unknown.

Having spoken thus of the order of Providence as conducted by general and unvarying laws, I must add (simply to preclude misunderstanding) that variations from those laws are not impossible to the philosophical believer in God as their author. In certain conceivable circumstances (which the Christian believes to have actually occurred), it is quite conceivable to the Theist that those laws should have been held in suspense or overruled by Sovereign power. In certain peculiar circumstances of a very special kind, and for purposes most rare and exceptional, it might as plainly bespeak the Divine wisdom and goodness so to vary from their uniformity, as in most circumstances it does to maintain them inviolate. For, to the Theist, the law is not itself an

agent, but a mode of the Divine agency. Its being generally observed is no proof that it cannot be occasionally disregarded, or remitted, or superseded. Miracles, in short, are not incredible in themselves to a believer in Providence; though to a philosophical believer they are, *a priori*, not to be expected, and require, when alleged, the most rigorous investigation. Human laws are sometimes suspended by act of sovereign grace. And the Divine Will which ordains can unquestionably dispense. Miracles do not imply that a result is produced without a cause. The Great Cause of causes is proclaimed in them to be still, as always, acting, only in a manner wholly unintelligible to us instead of partly so. That God, if He saw fit to commission any human being to become peculiarly and conspicuously the messenger of His will to mankind or any portion of them, should anticipate in his person the ordinary processes by which knowledge is advanced, and impart to him supernatural wisdom,—that He should also incircle him, as it were, with a zone of superhuman power, and make outward miracles wait upon his bidding,—is not in itself more improbable than that such attestations should be limited to the very rarest occasions, and that for the sake of man's happiness and improvement the ordinary operations of Providence should be conducted with a scrupulous regard to self-imposed laws. We do not now discuss the historical question whether such interventions have ever taken place, but simply protest that that question, as a question of fact, is not precluded by the philosophy of general laws in the course of Providence. If the final cause of Nature's uniformity be, as the Theist believes with profoundest reverence, man's general good,—man's more special good may have been also the suggestive cause of the gospel miracles. A higher uniformity of Divine purpose may have been evinced by such a variation from the uniformity of method. And the true and comprehensive analogy of the Divine dealings may be found, perhaps, in miracles sometimes and general laws always.

CHARACTER.

THAT character is built on a false and hollow basis which is formed, not from the dictates of our own breast, but solely from the fear of censure. What is the essence and the life of character? Principle, integrity, independence! or, as one of our great old writers hath it, "that inbred loyalty to Virtue which can serve her without a livery." These are qualities which hang not upon any man's breath.—*Bulwer*.

THE SUNDAY QUESTIONS:

OR, HOW SUNDAY CAME; HOW TO USE IT BEST; AND HOW TO LEGISLATE
(AND NOT LEGISLATE) ABOUT IT.

IT is impossible to exaggerate the importance of a regularly returning day of rest. It is not less essential to our bodily than to our spiritual welfare. All our faculties and powers, from the lowest to the highest, are relieved, refreshed and benefited by it. Health and strength are renewed. Cheerfulness and elasticity are regained for work and duty. Cleanliness is promoted, and therein health both of body and of mind. Home comforts, home pleasures, home endearments, are tasted by most families in a greater degree than they can be on the days of labour. The mind of the intelligent, set free from business toils and cares, finds, in many cases, its choicest opportunities of improvement; in many more, its healthiest recreation in thoughts and inquiries of a different kind from those which demand the daily stretch of its faculties. And last, greatest and highest advantage, yet not altogether distinct from all these things, but also pervading and directing them all,—the serious, contemplative, duty-loving and religious mind finds in its sabbath of rest the new growth of active devotion and love, the quickening of its piety and benevolence, the opportunity of social worship and religious instruction and exhortation, of self-examination and new self-consecration to the Great Father of the spirits of all flesh.

The alternation of day and night meets the most urgent necessities of our mortal nature in these respects, refreshing us with sleep and giving us (if we will accept it) the opportunity and suggestion of quiet thought, self-consecration and devotion, both when we lie down and when we awake to find ourselves still with God. But the added rest of one day in seven is, as it were, the comfort and luxury of our bodily and spiritual well-being, added to the mere necessities of bodily and mental existence. Our Sunday is at once the labourer's charter and the religious heart's earthly paradise.

How came we by this blessing? And how ought we to cherish, use and improve it?

It is not, as with the alternation of day and night, a law in the physical constitution of the globe that marks out one day in seven as reserved from the claims of ordinary labour. There is no Sabbath written in the revolutions of the heavenly bodies, which pursue their untiring rounds all days alike. There is no Sabbath in the winds, the tides, the rivers, the trees, plants, or any of the divine activities which, upon the surface of our earth, proclaim to us the work of the Creator. "The Father worketh yet." Man's Sabbath is no institution of the physical world, however it may meet alike the lowest needs and the highest desires, the earliest and the latest demands of human nature.

It prevails over certain large portions of the world ;—over the Christian, where it is observed on a certain day ; over the Mahometan, where it is observed on a different day ; and among the scattered Jewish people everywhere, by whom it is observed on yet a different day ;—by all of them, one day in seven, though not the same day ; and by none but Jews, Christians and Mahometans, is the observance known at all. The most enlightened nations of antiquity had nothing of the kind. The heathenism of barbarous countries at the present day knows it not. The civilization of the present day, joined with its intense activity, industry and enterprize, and its too eager love of wealth, luxury and parade on the one hand, with its keen competitions for subsistence on the other, would never, never have devised such a thought as that of throwing away a seventh part of the work and produce of life, for the bodily ease or the spiritual benefit of either hand-workers or head-workers. It is plainly not ascribable to human sagacity to have recognized so profound a need of its own, and to have provided for it by a periodical cessation of toil. Historically, indeed, we trace it to a different origin ; while, however, the grounds on which we may now reasonably advocate the continued preservation of this day of rest, the uses which we may rightly make of it, and especially the duty of our legislators, positively or negatively, in reference to it, are less easily defined perhaps than some persons may be ready to suppose.

Nothing can, indeed, be more unsatisfactory than the state of the public mind, in Parliament and out, on the “Sunday Question,” as exhibited during the last few years ; on the following occasions, for instance :—(1) in the stoppage of the Sunday delivery of letters by the Government, through deference to a Sabbatarian cry, till another cry of indignation at so mean a compliance restored the previous practice ; (2) in the vehemence with which the proprietary of the Crystal Palace were assailed and driven from their purpose of seeking power to open its grounds at least on Sunday afternoons ; (3) in the more recent attempt of Lord Robt. Grosvenor to restrain Sunday trading among the operative classes, which in its turn was forced to yield to the demonstrations of Hyde-Park mobs ; and (4) within the last few weeks, in the rejection of Sir J. Walmsley’s motion for opening the British Museum and National Gallery on Sunday afternoons, by a majority of 376 to 48 votes,—the Prime Minister himself avowing that he voted (as doubtless a large part of the majority did) against a motion with which he personally sympathized. The last-mentioned motion might indeed be felt to fall somewhat beside the true mark to be aimed at, by those who realize as the great Sunday want of the dwellers in our great cities, that of fresh air and natural scenery. But any how, this instance, with its accompaniments of Sabbatarian agitation, dogmatic assertion, and impracticable demand, is no exception to the facts which

shew a confused opinion on the whole subject, not confined indeed to Sabbatarian petitioners and agitators, but partaken by compromising statesmen.

The combined result of the existing law and custom in England (and I confess I do not know in all cases just what is law and what is custom),—but their joint result is, on the whole, to give to every subject of the land (with very few exceptions) all practicable *liberty to use his Sunday as he pleases*, under the obvious limitation of his not so using it as to interfere with the equal liberty of other persons. Sunday is “no day” in business contracts and obligations. Government offices are closed; or their being open is exceptional, as a necessity of the public service. Sunday is understood as not included (without a word being said about it) in the ordinary contracts for work and wages between employer and employed. The latter is free to spend it in his own way, according to his own perception of what is right. Any claims which the public service or private business may make upon Sunday work are exceptional and special. And not a few such there are and must be.

Certain *public officers* must be employed. Their duties may be lightened that day; they may have the alternate Sundays, perhaps, to themselves; but their duties cannot be left undone that day without peril to society.

The *police*, of the large towns especially, cannot all keep sabbath together. That would be to proclaim the saturnalia of thieves and plunderers.

The *Post-office* cannot, without such detriment to the vital interests of a community like ours as no wise legislature would venture to inflict, cease its functions altogether this day; but the practice with us is to diminish its duties so far as to give all practicable liberty to its numerous officials one day in seven, while not so far as seriously to impair the public service. Letters are neither posted nor delivered in London that day, but in the country they are both posted and delivered;—a distinction untenable on any hard Sabbatarian principle, but productive of the practical lull of work desired. All these matters are difficult indeed to arrange in detail, but plainly they do not admit of any hard line being drawn, such as some have attempted.

Certain trades and occupations there are that cannot stand still on Sundays.

The *sailor*, on his voyage, cannot rest that day. He cannot cast anchor in the deep sea. The winds blow as usual, the currents set as usual that day, favouring or retarding his progress, and demanding all his vigilance and activity. His sabbath, as regards rest, may be some Saturday or Monday of gently favouring breezes; and some stormy Sunday may be his day of hardest work and extreme peril. Yet on ship-board, where a religious spirit presides, the Sunday is not unobserved, and on that day

especially men are encouraged to "see the works of the Lord and His wonders in the deep."

Many great *manufacturing processes* cannot altogether stand still on the Sunday. Smelting furnaces are not permitted to cool down from one year's end to another, except for the purpose of repair. Even the engine-fires in our factories are kept gently burning, requiring a small degree of attention on the Sunday, which we should call it Pharisaic, superstitious or ignorant, in any man to scruple.

Some trades, as that of the *public baker*, may save Sunday labour in some hundreds of families by devoting that of one person,—who, however, it must be hoped, is not the same every Sunday, for *he* ought not to give up *all* his days of rest.

Public *conveyances* can hardly be required to abstain from running on Sundays, whether omnibuses and cabs in our great towns and cities, or steam-packets and railway-trains running away from those towns and cities. Matter of curious and difficult detail there may be to settle as to all these things; and, in point of fact, the railway arrangements in general do differ much on Sundays from those of other days, and chiefly by diminishing the number of their trains down to what is considered the lowest point required by public convenience, and by respecting the morning hours of public worship; but he who would stop all these means of locomotion ought, in common consistency, to be prepared to forbid the use of private carriages by those who are rich enough to keep them. How few Sabbatarians are thus equitable!

We might allude also to the case of *medical men*, whose function is not permitted to cease on the Sunday, because (in the established phrase of the religious world itself) theirs are works of *necessity* or of *mercy*. Sickness keeps no seventh-day rest. And yet, on the principle of rest from the daily strain of work (mental work more severe than bodily toil), it would surely be the greatest blessing to any medical man in large practice to have his thoughts as free as possible that day for quite another set of subjects than those which engross him almost day and night earnestly and often painfully. He is no wise physician to himself, who does not keep sabbath as much as possible when Sunday comes round.

Nor should the case of the clergy and ministers of religion be omitted, who, it is sometimes said, with futile attempt at wit, make the Sunday their own great day of work, while forbidding others to work on it. In answer to the Sabbatarian or Pharisaic view of Sunday, we may indeed avow for ourselves, as Jesus Christ did on behalf of the ministers of the public service in the Jewish temple, that "the priests in the temple do profane the Sabbath (as Pharisees call *profaning*), and are blameless." And the Christian minister, after making this avowal, should never,

methinks, be found advocating a Pharisaic observance of the Sunday. But speaking myself as a minister, and vindicating, as I do, the importance of a periodical rest for the mind, exercised, tried, perhaps jaded and worn in the business of the counting-house, or in the profession of medicine or law, when it may regain health and elasticity by intire change of thought and excitement, and find its best health in the highest religious exercise,—so, and for the same reasons, I avow that he whose chief thoughts and studies day by day, and cumulatively on the Sunday, are employed upon things directly relating to theology, morals and religion, had need find his repose from time to time in other studies and interests not so directly religious (yet good and right), nor involving the same mental strain as those of his particular calling. And I believe the ministerial functions of such a man will become all the more healthy and effective by his freely mingling in all such secular duties and interests of daily life as fairly fall in his way; and not least, if he is in part subjected to the common lot of his fellow-men in having to labour (beyond the duties of his ministry) for the support of himself and his family. The danger which besets a devoted clergyman of becoming a man of one set of thoughts, without breadth of mind or comprehensiveness of sympathy, is precisely that (only in a very different department) which besets the merchant, the lawyer or the man of business. And the very blessing which the Sabbath affords to the latter classes when in danger of being enslaved to their professional or technical or worldly life, the minister of religion must seek in honourable and useful work less directly theological and religious.

Such are a few instances of the mixed and complicated observance of Sunday as actual among us. On the whole, they plainly bespeak a disposition to minimize, as far as practicable, the amount of work and service claimed from certain classes of society, in helping the community in general to claim the Sunday for rest and devotion. They shew also that there is no clear and absolute line capable of being laid down, by which certain specific actions are in all cases to be judged right or allowable, and certain others always wrong, on Sundays, while permissible on other days. Perhaps they might suggest to us, that the whole subject should be treated by us, not as one of hard, rigid, outside enactment and stern, formal compliance, but as one of cheerful, blessed privilege, aiming to make men happy in the first place, and in that spirit to make them better. Instead of invoking the constraints of human law, we shall do well to cultivate the moral and devotional sense of the people.

Let us inquire now into the scriptural bearings of the Sunday question. It divides itself into two stages of progress, namely, the *Jewish Sabbath* and the *Christian Lord's-day*. These stages are connected; but, in argumentative justice, ought not to be

confounded as they often are. In point of fact, we have derived our observance of a day of rest and devotion from the Jews; whether by mere imitation of their practice, or by the recognition of their authority, is a matter of history easily accessible. How then did the Jews first get it? is our preliminary inquiry. And the answer here is plain.

The Jews owed their Sabbath to its proclamation by Moses in the desert on the giving of the manna, and to the Law of Mount Sinai, where it stands as one of the Ten Great Commandments of God to Israel.

The first four of those Commandments relate to the Divine Being and the worship due to Him; declaring His unity, forbidding idolatry, forbidding to take His name in vain, and enjoining to "remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." The other six of these Commandments relate to the duties of man to man, enjoining honour to parents as the first with a national promise, and forbidding in succession the great social crimes of murder, adultery, stealth, false-witness and covetousness.

I confess I have always been struck to observe in what company the Jewish Decalogue places the law of the Sabbath. All the rest of these Ten Commandments are laws of everlasting morals; this alone can be called a ceremonial or outward institution. The books of Moses elsewhere contain multitudes of laws relating to rites and ceremonies, to sacrifices and offerings, to feasts and festivals, as given by the Lawgiver himself on other occasions. But the law of the Sabbath is placed among the former, not among the latter. Certainly this is giving it a remarkable precedency over all the other laws enjoining ceremonies. When it is argued, then, that the Sabbath, being only a ceremonial institution, was to come to an end like all the rest of the ceremonial law, though I do not claim the authority of Moses as my reason for holding fast to this privilege of a day of rest, yet I see in its institution by Moses, and its classification with the greatest religious and moral precepts of his Law, the mark of superhuman wisdom, interpreting at once a deep need and a high faculty of human nature, and providing for both in a manner that man's unaided wisdom has nowhere in the world instituted. How was it that, while the Greeks in their wisdom counted their months (lunar months) by three periods of ten days each, and the Romans with their very practical turn of mind appointed every eighth day for a market-day, they proclaimed no sort of *rest* either on the eighth day in the one instance, or on the tenth in the other? Moses alone discerned this great necessity of man physically and man spiritually; or rather, He who raised up Moses to guide the Jewish people, and made that people the suggesters of a pure religious faith to the world, gave this beneficent idea of a weekly recurring rest, through that people, to the world.

Some readers of Scripture endeavour to trace the origin of the Sabbath much higher than to the days of Moses. They think they find it written in that splendid poem of Creation with which the book of Genesis opens, where it is declared that "on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made; and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." And hence some have too positively argued that the "World's Sabbath," as distinguished from the Jewish, was proclaimed from the very creation, and that a Jewish Sabbath was afterwards ordained by Moses. But certainly the world never knew anything of its Sabbath except through Moses. There is no intimation, in the whole book of Genesis, of any observance of the Sabbath having been practised by any of the patriarchs; and as we do not know to what period to ascribe the production of this poetical and devout song of the Creation, we cannot positively decide whether it was the germ of the Mosaic law of the Sabbath, or whether the latter reflected itself upon the poet's thought of creation. At any rate, the Sabbath in the second chapter of Genesis is described simply as the *Sabbath of God* (beautiful figure, but highly figurative indeed of Him who "worketh hitherto"—still and always); it is not enjoined upon Adam and Eve as an institution for man, nor seems to have been known to mankind at all until taught by Moses to the Israelites in the desert.

Whether, in this earliest picture of the Creation, as having occupied six days, followed by a day of rest for the Great Artificer, or in the institution by Moses of a seventh day as a Sabbath for man, there is (as some think) a tacit allusion to the number of the planets as known to the ancients, it is not necessary for us now to inquire. Seven was certainly a sacred number, elsewhere than among the Jews, and was elsewhere connected with the number of the planets. One point is quite clear, that Moses gave the people of Israel their seventh day of rest. All this is pointed out most clearly and convincingly by Paley in his *Moral and Political Philosophy* (b. v. c. vii.).

Sabbath, be it observed, means *rest*; nothing more nor less (though some regard the word as etymologically connected also with the number *seven*). It conveys the idea of quiet, contemplative enjoyment. And in spite of the prominence of Sabbatarian strictness in the later periods of Jewish history, I do not find that the Jewish idea itself was anything but a cheerful and happy one. It was meant as their relief from work, but not as their destination to gloom. The Old Testament is singularly silent as to the manner in which the Sabbath was spent during all the centuries from Moses down to the time of David. The Law describes, indeed, various special offerings which were to be

presented in the tabernacle on that day; and we assume that this was done, as afterwards in the temple; in both of which buildings we know also that, in the times of David and Solomon, there was added the musical recitation of sacred psalms. No doubt those who dwelt in the neighbourhood of the sacred place frequented its Sabbath services as well as the daily ones; the former, probably, more numerous than the latter. But, let it be remembered, there was *only one such place* of worship for the whole land of Judea, and we consult the history in vain to learn *how the Sabbath was observed elsewhere*. In the days of the prophets, from Samuel downwards, we seem to gather from a passing hint (2 Kings iv. 23) that the Sabbaths, as well as the new moons, were days when the people resorted to their prophets for counsel and instruction. One of these prophets (Isaiah lviii. 13) describes the true use of the Sabbath as “a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable;” and another (Hosea ii. 11) implies that it was, like the new moons and other solemn festivals, a day of rejoicing; for he says, predicting the captivity of Israel, “I will cause all her mirth (joy) to cease, her feast days, her new moons and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts.”

On the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon, it is generally admitted that the erection of synagogues for the purpose of public worship and instruction soon took place throughout the land; and thus the general celebration of public worship, on the Sabbath-day especially, became established. The temple at Jerusalem was still the only place for *sacrifice*; but in every synagogue throughout the land they met for prayer and singing and reading the Scriptures, the Jewish synagogue worship being in fact the prototype of our own. Nor is there any reason to believe that, at this time, the day thus appropriated in part to public worship was anything but a joyous day of rest and refreshment to body and spirit.

I am enabled to fortify this statement by the views of an intelligent and exemplary Hebrew of the present day, from whom I have a letter containing the following explanation of the feelings with which his community regard the Christian Sabbatarian zeal:

“We to this day enjoy the Sabbath as a perfect day of rest, avoiding all labour, and not permitting our ‘man-servant, or maid-servant, or cattle,’ to do any work. Consequently, we do not *ride* out on the Sabbath-day, but content ourselves with cheerful recreation, in walking a *limited* distance, and in social intercourse. We should think it quite consistent with our duties to go to the British Museum, a Gallery of Pictures, or any other tranquil exhibition where *money* was not required to be *paid* for entrance. We are taught to observe the Sabbath after the manner named by Isaiah, lviii. 13, 14. In Nehemiah xiii. 19, you will observe how strictly we are enjoined not to go beyond the gates of the city. With us, the same rule is observed by the rich and poor. We therefore look with surprise to see the gay equipages of bishops and the aristocracy dashing through the streets, to convey their burdens to

and from church, to enjoy the air of the parks and surrounding country, and to know that the clergy and their friends have gay dinner parties, thus requiring the *laborious* exercise of servants and cattle, while the poorer classes are deprived of the facilities which they might have for rational enjoyment on the only day free from the necessity of labour.

"I wish it were in my power to assist you in your laudable endeavour to correct the feeling which would make the *bitter* observance of the Sabbath imperative on the poor, by offering him better means of recreation than are too often found in the dram-shop."

In this interesting letter my friend refers to one passage already quoted here; and to another (Nehem. xiii. 19), in the interpretation of which I must presume to differ from him, and to think that the Jewish rabbis impose a needless and unintended restraint upon such of their community as reside in dense cities, in forbidding them to go out into the fresh air of the country. Nehemiah, it appears, closed the gates of Jerusalem during the Sabbath-day against the entrance of all kinds of *burdens and marketable commodities*, which various persons were bringing in. It seems to me that, in so doing, he maintained the spirit of the Jewish institution as a day of rest for man and beast; but that the rabbis, in inferring thence that no Jew residing in Manchester or London, for instance, ought to walk out among God's beautiful works, on his chartered day, to refresh himself from the most oppressive of all the influences that are peculiar to this age and country of great towns, impose upon themselves and their community a burden which Nehemiah would never have contemplated if he could have realized the thought of a modern London or Manchester, even if he meant the restriction to be so understood (which I greatly doubt) in Jerusalem in his own day. My friend's letter abundantly shews, however, that the Jewish Sabbath itself is not responsible for half the gloomy, narrow views (and for none of the social unfairness) which some among us would impress upon the Christian Lord's-day, and which others repudiate as "Jewish." Our modern Sabbatarians would copy the Sabbath of the Pharisees, not that of Moses and the Prophets. The Jewish precedent itself, if it were admitted to be *binding* upon Christians, would by no means bear out their suggested conclusions.

But is it binding on Christians? This is the second stage of the scriptural inquiry.

Something less than 200 years before Christ, we find the Pharisee sect in existence, who figure so conspicuously, but so unenviably, in the New Testament, writhing under the lash of Christ's indignation for their ceremonialism, ostentation and hypocrisy. These men gave the Jewish Sabbath quite a new character. Its purpose with them was not rest and religious gladness, but gloom and moroseness. They made it a burden instead of a delight. They are sufficiently described in the New

Testament as doing all their works to be seen of men,—as binding heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, which they themselves would not stretch one of their fingers to move,—as paying tithe of mint, anise and cummin, and forgetting the weightier matters of the Law, justice, mercy and truth,—as appearing righteous before men, but inwardly full of corruption.

How did Jesus Christ then, we next ask, meet these Sabbatarians of his day, and what has he said or done that may guide Christians to a true view of the Sabbath?

He who had a gentle word for every repentant sinner, had none for these Pharisees. He seems studiously to have set their Sabbath traditions at defiance by performing many of his miraculous cures on the Sabbath-day, thus provoking their angry charge against him of being a Sabbath-breaker, and replying that it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath,—that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,—and that he, the Son of Man, was, as if on behalf of humanity, “Lord even of the Sabbath.”

It was our Saviour’s custom, we learn, to go on the Sabbath into the synagogues, and to read and interpret the Scriptures to the congregations assembled there. Doing thus, and protesting as he did against the Pharisaic abuse of the day, he seems to have asserted its original design as a day of blessed rest and religious cheerfulness given by divine authority to the Jews; but no hint whatever is recorded as given by him about its future observance or non-observance by other nations than the Jews. As to the perpetual obligation of the Jewish Sabbath, or the substitution of any other day as obligatory upon Christians of all ages and countries, our Lord and Master has said nothing.

Our Saviour’s personal ministry came to an end. He rose from the dead the day after the Jewish Sabbath, and his disciples appear to have held that morning in thankful remembrance every week as it returned, and presently to have called it (as we find it so called once in the New Testament, namely, in the Revelation of John) the “Lord’s-day.” St. Paul finds disciples at Troas meeting together (Acts xx. 7) on the first day of the week, as a religious custom, to break bread in memory of Christ; and in his letter to the Corinthians, he directs that certain contributions for the poor Christians in Jerusalem should be paid on that day. These and similar instances seem to prove that it was the habit of the early churches to meet together on the first day of the week for religious worship. But it is hardly to be supposed that they kept that day free from all secular work. Living under heathen governments, where no such thing as a day of general rest was known, they could not do it except very imperfectly; nor is there any proof that they regarded their observance of the Lord’s-day as in any way transferring to it the obligations of the Jewish Sabbath law. Nay, this same apostle Paul speaks most

strongly in reprobation of certain persons who in his day insisted upon imposing the Jewish Sabbath upon the observance of Christians; and he so speaks as to shew plainly that he is not deprecating from Saturday what he approves for Sunday; while, however, he bids every one, whether Jewish or Gentile Christian, obey his own sense of what is right in this matter. To the Colossians he writes, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ." To the Galatians he says, "After that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days and months and times and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." And to the Romans he says, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it."

These passages are sometimes wrongly quoted as if to shew that it would be better to make no distinction between Sundays and other days. A dreary conclusion indeed for the sons of toil, whatever it might be for the sons of God! I take them as intimating (what other passages of Paul's writings clearly shew) that he anticipated the *speedy consummation of earthly things*; and regarding the Jewish state and ceremonies as obsolete, and the heavenly state as about to ensue, he would have had every intervening day made equally a Sabbath till the consummation should arrive. The late Mr. Robertson, of Brighton, expresses the same view:

"Who is he who needs not the day? He is the man so rich in love, so conformed to the mind of Christ, so elevated into the sublime repose of heaven, that he needs no carnal ordinances at all, nor the assistance of one day in seven to kindle spiritual feelings, seeing he is, as it were, all his life in heaven already.

"And, doubtless, such the apostle Paul expected the Church of Christ to be. Anticipating the second advent at once, not knowing the long centuries of slow progress that were to come, his heart would have sunk within him could he have been told that at the end of eighteen centuries the Christian Church would be still observing days and months and times and years, and, still more, needing them." (Sermons preached at Trinity Chapel, Brighton, by the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, the incumbent. Second Series, pp. 187, 188.)

The same writer, in the same discourse (boldly intitled, "The Sydenham Palace and the Religious Non-observance of the Sabbath"), thus describes the real observance of the Lord's-day as it prevailed among the apostolic Christians:

"The Lord's-day sprung, not out of a transference of the Jewish Sab-

bath from Saturday to Sunday, but rather out of the idea of making the week an imitation of the life of Christ. With the early Christians, the grand conception was that of following their crucified and risen Lord; they set, as it were, the clock of time to the epochs of his history. Friday represented the Death in which all Christians daily die, and Sunday the Resurrection in which all Christians daily rise to higher life. What Friday and Sunday were to the week, that Good Friday and Easter Sunday were to the year. And thus, in larger or smaller cycles, all time represented to the early Christians the mysteries of the Cross and the Risen Life hidden in humanity. And as the sunflower turns from morning till evening to the sun, so did the early Church turn for ever to her Lord, transforming week and year into a symbolical representation of His Spiritual Life."—P. 186.

Time went on, and the expected advent of Christ did not take place. The destruction of Jerusalem came, and the end of the Jewish state and religion, which was the real coming of Christ foretold by himself, though unsatisfactory still to the view of many who continued to expect his personal appearance upon earth again. The Lord's-day was still the day of special Christian worship; and the idea of a weekly day of rest and worship, freed not only from Pharisaic strictness, but also from the Mosaic ceremonial, seems to have approved itself more and more to the religious feelings, not only of the Jewish, but of the Gentile believers. For a while both Saturday and Sunday seem to have been observed in some churches. Of course it was not till Christianity had been taken under the patronage of the world's rulers that a day of rest could be legalized and become general. Doubtless it was a welcome gift from country to country, relieving the bodies of men from the oppression of their ceaseless round of toil, and lifting their minds to intelligent and solemn thoughts.

This blessing we have copied from the Jews, but without imitating all its Jewish specialties. And though we may not quote the Law of Moses as making it incumbent upon us to sacrifice lambs every Sabbath upon the altars of our churches and place shew-bread upon their tables, yet we may devoutly thank the generous spirit of Judaism for having given the world the idea of a stated day of rest. It was an idea which the world's wisdom never gained, and the world's selfish competitions never would have allowed; but which, when shewn in the light from Sinai, approved itself as meeting the most palpable of human wants and providing for the highest of human aspirations, and which, as its original observance was obliterated from the once Holy Land, was gratefully adopted throughout the Christian churches of the vast Roman empire, to become the law of the land through an ever-enlarging Christendom, and to be again imitated by the scarcely less numerous tribes who call Mahomet their prophet and worship God on Fridays.

(To be concluded in the next No.)

REMARKS ON TWO HYMNS BY MRS. BARBAULD AND DR.
PEABODY.

OF the two well-known pieces, Mrs. Barbauld's "Death of the Virtuous,"

"Sweet is the scene when virtue dies!"

and Peabody's somewhat similar one,

"Behold the western evening light!"

we have been particularly struck with the distinctive impression. They are adopted, 375 and 376, in Martineau's Hymns for the Christian Church and Home, and are as follows:

"Sweet is the scene when virtue dies;
When sinks a righteous soul to rest;
How mildly beam the closing eyes,
How gently heaves the expiring breast!
So fades a summer cloud away;
So sinks the gale when storms are o'er;
So gently shuts the eye of day;
So dies a wave along the shore.
Triumphant smiles the victor-brow,
Fanned by some angel's purple wing;
Where is, O Grave, thy victory now?
And where, insidious Death, thy sting?
Farewell, conflicting joys and fears,
Where light and shade alternate dwell!
How bright the unchanging morn appears!
Farewell, inconstant world, farewell!
Its duty done, as sinks the clay,
Light from its load the spirit flies!
While heaven and earth combine to say,
'Sweet is the scene when virtue dies.'"

"Behold the western evening light!

It melts in deeper gloom;
So calm the righteous sink away,
Descending to the tomb.

The winds breathe low,—the yellow leaf
Scarce whispers from the tree!
So gently flows the parting breath,
When good men cease to be.

How beautiful, on all the hills,
The crimson light is shed!
'Tis like the peace the dying gives
To mourners round his bed.

How mildly on the wandering cloud
The sunset beam is cast!
So sweet the memory left behind,
When loved ones breathe their last.

And lo! above the dews of night
The vesper star appears!
So faith lights up the mourner's heart,
Whose eyes are dim with tears.

Night falls, but soon the morning light
Its glories shall restore;
And thus the eyes that sleep in death
Shall wake, to close no more."

Now let the reader observe in what they differ, and he will at once be sensible of that which gives the former an incomparably deeper hold upon his mind. At first sight, they might be judged to be very similar; there is much of the same expressive imagery in both, much of the same solemn incidents of human experience; and yet how great the difference!—as great, indeed, as can be conceived. It appears in the opening of each. The scene of one is the presence of the departing spirit,—that of the other, a summer's evening. These are respectively the distinct realities into the presence of which the writer immediately summons you, and the state of mind induced by which abides with you throughout;—in the one, the feeling inspired by a holy death—in the other, by the evening light. And the difference between the rapt emotion of the former, and the rather æsthetic than emotional character of the latter, is the difference of the two poems. The order of thought, obeying the suggestion of the scene, marks again the difference. In the one, the highest thought, and in this case the highest possible, has the first place throughout; in the other, it has only the second place. This consequence of the immeasurable height of the theme of the one poem over that of the other, is but too palpable in every stanza of the second. In the first poem, the divine spirit in man glorifies Nature; in the second, at the best, Nature is likened to man that has already lent her his attributes,—and viewed, moreover, in his highest light, her likeness does not entirely hold. What is the idea given forth from the vivid impression of the inspired scene the writer of the first poem had indubitably witnessed? The very atmosphere of heaven diffusing itself with the beaming of even the closed eye, and the peace of God in that perfect rest! In its presence conscious Nature is hushed and glorified, and a language given to her elements which they softly whisper back; that final smile has recognized other restoratives than earth, the unchanging morn has beamed, holier ministrants are near. This, then, is the poem—first the Soul, then Nature; the Soul, that has given a glory in giving itself to Nature, receiving the rich tribute back in her greatest hour, and welcoming its sweet ministration the more, that it has at last borne it to the perfectness that shews how blessed it has been. This is the height to which we are summoned by this exquisite poem, a height that becomes

more ethereal as it proceeds, till it leaves us in a region where heaven and earth are one.

The author of the other poem, instead of coming fresh from the great impression of the inspired scene of the departing soul, and raising you at once to the high argument which is to glorify all beneath it,—instead of placing you at once in the presence of the most momentous human incident and filling all else with its power,—commences with a scene from nature, very impressive and of acknowledged influence, but still from nature, and not from man; and with its varying aspects he compares the several circumstances of that momentous human experience, witnessed, it may be recently witnessed, by him it is true, but only furnishing him with the remembered points of resemblance which the scene from nature now before him suggests, and not, as in the other case, made the very atmosphere of the poem. It happens, therefore, that though most of the natural images are the same, they have nothing approaching the intensity and power; in the one, they receive the glory of the Spirit into whose presence they are summoned; in the other, they suggest it in its absence. It is the difference of subjects in the presence of their sovereign, and of subjects reflecting only the influence of their absent lord. You may enjoy the repose of the latter, but it is nothing like the inspiration of the former. Moreover, this poem is too set and regular, too exact and adaptive in its fittings; nature is too much a reflex of man; the soul made to find its counterpart too completely in outward phenomena; and so the accident of its subject and secondary place, which the nature of the poem necessitated, is aggravated by its being thus, as it were, almost chained, though by fascinating links, to the material world. This is unreal and untrue. That there should be something in the soul to which nature has no parallel,—this is its greatest glory. Its entire dissimilarity, therefore, and infinite superiority is more than all analogy, and it is only where itself originates the analogy that the analogy is of use. See, then, the difference between these poems. In one, the glory of the soul is the great independent spiritual fact, lending its glory to all else; from its upper region you look upon the universe lighted by its ray;—in the other, you look through subsidiary nature up to it, and only through subsidiary nature do you look at it at all; in nature's colours only is it dressed, and to nature's necessities only is it conformed. This becomes an indignity to the spirit, which is not of nature, nor unto nature doth return. Observe the error incident to the process. Some allowance must be made for the imperfection of language and our double nature in the flesh. But because day sinks into night, we are made to descend into the tomb; because the wind falls, we cease to be. The same may be objected to Mrs. Barbauld's poem; but it is a momentary difficulty; it is an immediate passage to

life, of which in it you are conscious throughout. The failing senses are those of the body, and as releasing the soul, they impart their significance to nature's resembling ministries. If "virtue dies," it is a bold personification, in which we feel at once that that which alone has ennobled the body "then chiefly lives." She celebrates the triumph of life, the supremacy of the soul; there is no grave, no death; the immortal spirit fills heaven and earth with its glory. She begins with the only life, and lifts you up to it throughout; consequently there is no error, there is no squaring or conforming the spirit to material phenomena: while it disdains not analogies, it can afford to fail in them, because it stands by its own law and is triumphant over all.

Dr. Peabody's imagery of night, repeated in his last stanza, though extremely obvious and common, cannot (as we hinted just now), when viewed in our highest spiritual light, be maintained. If the Soul is to give Nature her lessons, much more must it do so now that it has been illumined by the Christian revelation, and not receive its lessons from her, or continue to receive them as in times of ignorance. We are continually misled by broken and imperfect analogies in things that perish, when we ought in ourselves to seek the light that is to light up the whole creation of God. It ought not to be soothing to rest in a shortcoming material figure, when we have an everlasting truth in our own hearts. "Whosoever," said Christ, "drinketh of this water shall thirst again; but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a fountain of water springing up into everlasting life."

Mrs. Barbauld wrote a "Summer Evening's Meditation," and an extract, in perfect harmony with what we have endeavoured to point out as the excellence of her "Death of the Virtuous," shall conclude this paper:

"This dead of midnight is the noon of thought,
And Wisdom mounts her zenith with the stars.
At this still hour the self-collected soul
Turns inward, and beholds a stranger there
Of high descent, and more than mortal rank;
An embryo God; a spark of fire divine,
Which must burn on for ages, when the sun,—
Fair transitory creature of a day!—
Has closed his golden eye, and, wrapt in shades,
Forgets his wonted journey through the east."

R.

THE LATE MR. ROBERT SCOTT.

WHEN the earthly career of a man who has been gifted with great talents or large means of usefulness, and who has wisely improved his opportunities, is closed, a higher purpose is answered than soothing the feelings of friends—though that is motive enough—by publicly recording his actions and commending his virtues. The hands of those who labour for the public good are strengthened by every honest tribute paid to disinterested services. Public men of the best stamp are sufficiently rewarded by seeing that their labours are productive of good to others. They value reputation as an instrument of further good. It is the duty, however, of those who have been benefited by their services, to do what they can to reward exertion and self-denial by the meed of fame. It was under the influence of these considerations that, in recording last month the lamented death of Mr. Scott, we expressed a wish to receive a memoir of his life. That wish has been replied to by the communication from several quarters of materials for such an article, some of which have already appeared in print,* which we now arrange for our readers' benefit, with those additions which personal knowledge enables us to supply.

Mr. Robert Scott was the youngest son of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved and Ann (Kinder) his wife. He was born July 15, 1803, and was a twin. His twin sister, Emma Wellbeloved, became the wife of James Carter, Esq., the Chief Justice of New Brunswick. The year of their birth was that of the removal of the College from Manchester to York, in order to secure for the institution the invaluable services of Mr. Wellbeloved, who, in addition to reading lectures in various departments of study, presided over the domestic establishment. In the infancy of the College at York, the tutorial office was not, as it afterwards became, divided amongst three gentlemen, undertaking distinct departments, but chiefly rested on Mr. Wellbeloved. To those who know how ably he discharged his onerous duties (and there are gentlemen still living whose public career has long reflected honour on the learning of their sole tutor at York), it will not appear surprising that he did not attempt to conduct the whole of the education of his sons. The names of two of the elder sons appear on the roll of York students, but Robert was not a pupil in the College. His first schoolmaster was the Rev. Mr. Roberson, of Heald's Hall, in the West-

* In several newspapers well-written articles have appeared, mentioning Mr. Scott's claims on public esteem. The fullest and best was in the *Inquirer* of March 1st. The mention of this journal enables us to express our desire for its success, and our cordial sympathy with the earnest labours of its editor to promote Unitarian principles, and to secure for them a larger amount of honest support than they at present receive.

Riding of Yorkshire. The routine of this school was too mechanical, and the discipline was of the harsh and repulsive kind which had descended from the previous century, when the principles of true education were little understood. From Heald's Hall he was removed to Woodville, near Birmingham, where he had the great advantage of the instruction of the Rev. John Corrie, F.R.S. Mr. Corrie's scholarship was varied, and for his day profound. Classical literature, mathematics, pure and mixed, geography, history and political economy, had all received his attention. His mind, according to the testimony of one of his associates and friends, was characterized by the union of a love and knowledge of all that is elegant in taste, with the pursuit of those severer and more exact studies which have a direct bearing on most of the great interests of Man.* None but those who have enjoyed a similar advantage can sufficiently estimate the refined and enduring influences of early instruction from a master thus accomplished. Mr. Robert Wellbeloved found in Mr. Corrie a friend as well as a schoolmaster, and through life spoke with gratitude of his master's "genial and amiable character, his enlarged system of instruction, and his liberal treatment of his pupils." Another great advantage resulting from his being a pupil at Woodville was, that there began that intimate friendship with his father's friend, the late Rev. John Kentish, which led to other results, and to a still closer tie, affecting Mr. Wellbeloved's welfare through life. On quitting Mr. Corrie's school, he entered in 1819, but only for a single session, the University of Glasgow. The Professors whom he attended were Mr. Young in Greek, Mr. Jardine in Logic, and Mr. Mylne in Political Economy. Mr. Young was an enthusiastic lover of classical literature, learned in the niceties of the Greek language, fond of etymological disquisitions and the metaphysics of grammar; but much that was peculiar to him was in great part lost on the large class of boys whom he taught, not many of whom could construe Homer with any facility. Mr. Jardine was not a particularly able man, and in no respects an original thinker; but he was a laborious Professor, and kept his class in an excellent state of discipline. It was chiefly valuable as a school for composition. Weekly themes were required from each student, some of which were read aloud by such pupils as might be called up. The presence of 150 class-mates, and the desire of the Professor's approbation, served as a stimulus to youthful ambition. Connected with this class was a Debating Society, in which moral and historical subjects were discussed with considerable ardour. In the Logic Class and the Debating Society the English students were generally found to take a leading part; and Mr. Wellbeloved, resolutely persevering in

* See the Transactions of the Birmingham Philosophical Institution for 1839, quoted in C. R., 1840, p. 346.

whatever he undertook, secured an honourable position in both. At Glasgow he found a friendly companion and a valuable assistant in his studies in Mr. Edmund Kell, by some three years his senior in the College. The foundations were then laid for mutual respect, and a friendship which lasted through the life of the younger man. Reviewing their college intercourse, Mr. Kell, in a letter recently addressed to a relative of his friend, said, "In that year of intimate acquaintance with your brother-in-law, I was exceedingly pleased with the industry with which he pursued his studies, and the keen advantage which he took of the opportunities of instruction afforded him in the college. I have never known any one more benefited by that particular mode of developing the faculties pursued in the Logic Class. It seemed the very course calculated to call forth his powers of mind; and I believe the beneficial influences of that university instruction imparted liberality of thought and vigour of action to his whole after life."

Soon after quitting Glasgow in the spring of 1820, Mr. Robt. Wellbeloved was articled to a respectable solicitor in the city of York. He went through the duties and course of instruction usual to an articled pupil in an attorney's office, and afterwards, when he selected the higher branch of the profession of the law as that to which he would devote his attention, and still later when he became both an administrator of the law and was called upon to assist in the duties of legislation, he found that the practice which he had enjoyed during the term of his articles was productive of much advantage. A circumstance, in itself trifling, may yet be mentioned as indicative of the confidence felt in him at this period of his life. He was the personal friend of several of the students of the College, and, although a member of the family of the principal Professor, his presence was always welcomed at the students' parties, and they never thought of withholding from him a knowledge of those youthful frolics which sometimes, though rarely, disturbed the quiet of those studious halls.

Having a strong desire to go to the bar, he entered himself a student in the Middle Temple, and with unflinching resolution devoted himself to the study of law. While he was pursuing his studies, his attention was drawn, by the formation of a local society in which his father was interested for the protection of ancient footpaths, to the law of Paths and Highways. He prepared a treatise on the subject, and when ready for publication received permission to dedicate it to Lord Tenterden. Some personal civilities, received in consequence of that dedication, from so distinguished a Judge, were naturally very gratifying to a law student. His volume was received for a time as a useful digest, but is now superseded by more recent works. After being called to the bar, he remained for a short time in London, but finally

determined to settle as a provincial barrister. He hesitated for a time between Manchester and Birmingham. At the former place he would have found many of his father's friends both able and willing to promote his professional advancement, and especially he would have benefited by the friendship and great local influence of the late Mr. G. W. Wood. This gentleman, though not yet in Parliament, was actively promoting the cause of liberal politics, and employed Mr. Robert Wellbeloved in assisting him to draw up a Bill for transferring the representation from Penrhyn, one of the rotten and convicted Cornish boroughs, to the town of Manchester. It has been stated in a Worcestershire paper that at this time Mr. Wellbeloved joined the Northern circuit. This is, we are informed, an error. He very soon settled in Birmingham, and joined the Oxford circuit.

Not long after this, a material change took place in his position and prospects by his marriage with Sarah, the sole daughter and heiress of John Scott, Esq., of Stourbridge and Great Barr. On this auspicious event, which took place Feb. 17, 1830, he dropped the surname of Wellbeloved, and assumed, by Royal sign-manual, the name and arms of Scott. He continued for a time his practice as a barrister, in Birmingham and on the Oxford circuit.

The death of Mr. John Scott, his father-in-law, at the commencement of the following year, called Mr. Robert Scott to new and important duties. The management of estates in Stourbridge, and at Great Barr, in the county of Stafford, and afterwards in the county of Salop, required much time and attention, and the development of qualities for which there had been no previous call. The gentleman of whom he had become the successor and representative had, in the words of the late Mr. Kentish, been "greatly and deservedly esteemed in the relations of domestic life and of society, nor least in those which an English country gentleman sustains." The family of Scott had, according to the same authority, been distinguished for several generations alike by its usefulness and its virtues. (C. R., 12mo Series, XVIII. 42, 88.) To his arduous duties Mr. Scott applied himself with great energy, and with such success that the neighbours and dependants had no lasting reasons for regretting the change that had taken place. He was shortly after his marriage appointed a magistrate. He exercised this office in two counties, Stafford and Worcester, and in the latter held the higher office of Deputy-Lieutenant. He also received a Commissionership of Bankruptcy, and continued to act until the alteration of the system in 1842 abolished the office. He did not obtain these honours by the abandonment or modification of a single principle, political or religious. Avowing himself on all proper occasions, with equal firmness and moderation, in politics a Whig and a Reformer, and in religion a Protestant Dissenter and Unitarian, he succeeded

in gaining the respect of his magisterial colleagues and his neighbours generally of all parties. If, when party spirit ran high at Stourbridge, his presence on the bench were unwelcome to some who could not forget their own political prepossessions, he had the happiness of seeing these prejudices die away, and received from all sides ample acknowledgments of the respect entertained not less for his legal knowledge than for his fairness and impartiality. A legal gentleman of the county, who had many opportunities of observing the manner in which Mr. Scott discharged the duties of the magistracy, has recently given this honourable testimony respecting it: "Of calm and even temper, of inflexible integrity, and gifted with a capacity of mind eminently judicial, he discharged the duties of a magistrate with honour to himself and advantage to the community among whom he lived."

While on the subject of the magistracy, we are enabled to illustrate Mr. Scott's views respecting its duties by portions of a letter written on the occasion of a friend's appointment to the bench. That friend has always felt the value of the distinction drawn and the advice given by Mr. Scott.

"Great Barr, Dec. 14, 1844.

"My dear Sir,—I am glad that you are placed in the Commission. Good men may be useful there. * * *

"Perhaps you will allow me to draw your attention to the difference between your magisterial and judicial functions.

"In regard to the former,—e. g. preserving the peace and committing for trial persons suspected of felony,—your power is by your Commission and the Common Law, and is large and discretionary.

"But when you interfere to decide or punish under summary powers of conviction, it is by Act of Parliament, and by Act of Parliament alone, that you have any authority; and the terms of each Act of Parliament must be strictly complied with *to the letter*.

"Keeping this in mind, and being very careful in signing *warrants of distress*, I think you will find no difficulty in the execution of the duties of your office.

"For general reference in all the various cases of summary jurisdiction, Burn's Justice is the only good book. * * *

"Believe me very truly yours,

"ROBERT SCOTT."

When the first reformed Parliament was elected, Mr. Scott distinguished himself by the zeal and ability with which he supported the Liberal candidates in the county, and had the satisfaction of seeing Mr. Foley and Mr. Spencer returned for East Worcestershire. At the general election of 1841, the rising public feeling in favour of Free Trade, which five years later carried the repeal of the Corn Laws, obtained one of its earliest direct triumphs in the return of Mr. Scott, after a close contest, for the borough of Walsall. An election had a short time previously taken place, on a casual vacancy, in the borough, which

numbered 808 electors. The Conservative candidate, a brother of Mr. W. E. Gladstone (the late Chancellor of the Exchequer), then carried the election, the poll standing thus—Gladstone, 365; Smith, 327. The poll shewed a different result when Mr. Scott was a candidate, being, Scott, 334; Gladstone, 311. The Parliament to which Mr. Scott was thus elected in a manner as unexpected as honourable, proved fatal to Lord Melbourne's Government. Mr. Scott made no effort to become a party debater. In the discharge of the not less important duties in committee, he was sufficiently successful. He was enabled to carry a useful measure for attaching isolated portions of counties to that shire to which they have the largest common boundary. This is quoted as "Scott's Act."

Mr. Scott did not on entering Parliament transfer his residence to London. To this perhaps it was owing that attendance in the House of Commons was generally felt by him rather as a trouble than a pleasure. On occasions of importance he was always present, but he did not systematically or regularly attend to ordinary business; and at the ensuing general election in 1846, he retired from Parliament, on the avowed ground of its interference with his domestic habits and ordinary duties, to the regret of many friends who felt how admirably he was fitted, by natural abilities, acquired information, sound judgment and high principles, to render important service to the public, and obtain an honourable and extended reputation for himself. Of his temporary connection with the House of Commons, he was accustomed afterwards to say "that it was a great advantage to have been there."

In politics, Mr. Scott was a Whig. By birth and education he perhaps imbibed from his father attachment to the name and principles of Mr. Fox. In the county with which he became connected by marriage, he acted through all the earlier years of his public life in cordial co-operation with the chiefs of the great Whig houses of Foley and Lyttelton. Amongst the Whig statesmen of his own day, his greatest confidence was given to Mr. Fox's nephew and representative, Lord Holland, of whom, after his death, Mr. Scott said, that he had never upon any occasion as a statesman been wrong.

During his continuance in Parliament and subsequently, Mr. Scott was engaged in many public undertakings of great magnitude. For many years he was Chairman of the Birmingham Canal Company, which, under his direction, became and remains the most perfect system of water communication in the kingdom. As a Director of the Shrewsbury and Chester Railway Company, he was enabled to render most valuable service to it. Exposed to unexpected opposition from one of the great railway companies, he succeeded, by perseverance and an indomitable courage which won the admiration of his colleagues, in overcoming diffi-

culties which at one time seemed insuperable, and finally assisted in establishing the interests of the company on a safe and enduring position.

By personal conviction as well as by education an Unitarian Dissenter, and by his position at Stourbridge the representative of a family which, deriving its descent from one or more of the ejected clergy of 1662,* had always given zealous support to Protestant Dissent, Mr. Robt. Scott was looked up to as the natural leader of the Unitarians of Stourbridge. He faithfully fulfilled the duties of his position, and whether in taking measures for the support of the commodious and elegant meeting-house, for the comfort of the minister, or for the promotion of the principles in the profession of which the congregation was united, his time, counsel and aid were always ready. It is an unspeakable advantage to a religious society to possess a leader having influence, mental and moral cultivation, and a proper zeal. There is then a concentration of effort, and the misdirected zeal of persons lacking either discretion or proper respect for their pastor becomes harmless. Mr. Scott extended his countenance and aid far beyond the limits of the congregation with which he habitually worshiped. In the welfare of Manchester College he took a deep interest. When the question of its locality was matter of anxious discussion, he advocated, and with great ability, its provincial position. When the voice of the majority of the trustees declared in favour of its removal to London, he cheerfully acquiesced in the decision, and conferred on the Institution both advantage and honour by placing his son, Mr. J. C. Addyes Scott, as a student in the College and a resident of University Hall.

While warmly supporting the interests of the religious body to which he was so closely and by such various ties united, he did not forget other and more general duties. To the educational institutions of Stourbridge, as well as other places where he held property, he gave habitual support. Gifted with natural taste, he was a lover of art. To him was mainly owing the establishment in Stourbridge of the School of Design. To the close of his life it had the benefit of his fostering care, and it is now remembered with melancholy interest that one of the last public duties which he discharged was to preside at a meeting of the Council. In charity and individual kind services of every kind, he knew no party limits. He was to all the neighbour and the friend, ready to give his counsel, or, if required, more substantial help.

Any estimate of Mr. Scott's character would be imperfect which did not do justice to the rectitude of his principles, the

* Mr. William Fincher, an ancestor of the Scotts, was the ejected minister of Wednesbury, and contributed by his preaching to the establishment of Protestant Dissent in Worcester. Mr. Richard Fincher, his brother, was the ejected minister of St. Nicholas, in the city of Worcester.

high tone of his moral feelings, and the excellence of his heart. Placed by his marriage in a position different in many respects from that in which he was educated, he never through life departed in the smallest degree from the views, the interests or the friendships, to which he had attached himself in earlier life. Faithful and consistent in his religious as well as his political opinions, he also remained through life the faithful and consistent friend, the kind and affectionate relative, of all whose claims were founded upon the bonds of friendship or of kindred.

It will be surmised by those who did not know Mr. Scott, from what we have said of his habits of public and private serviceableness, that he led a remarkably active and laborious life. There is now reason for supposing that he had long tasked his strength beyond moderation. His presence was frequently claimed by tenants in three counties; deputations and directors' meetings summoned him repeatedly to London and other distant places. He never thought of sparing himself. The very facility with which long journeys are now taken may have led to an over-tasking of his strength, and prevented those immediately around him from observing the diminution of his vigour and the approach of disease. A week's illness sufficed to finish the work; and almost as soon as danger was feared by his family, and before many distant friends had learned that there was any suspension of his willing toils for others, he had ceased to live. He was supported in the closing scene by his religious convictions and hopes, and surveyed the sudden approach of death with perfect calmness and resignation. He made it a dying injunction that no eulogy should be pronounced at his funeral. That mournful ceremony was conducted with becoming solemnity. At Stourbridge the day was marked as one of sorrow, by the general closing during the morning hours of shops and other places of business. At Great Barr, the funeral procession was joined by Mr. Scott's tenants and many of the principal inhabitants of the district. A meeting of the Commissioners of the town of Stourbridge was convened at a few hours' notice, and resolutions were then unanimously passed of respect for Mr. Scott's memory, and sympathy with the bereaved family. On the Sunday following the funeral, the Rev. William Bowen (in the absence from England of Rev. John Dendy) preached an impressive sermon to the Stourbridge Unitarian congregation. Although his lips were, by the injunction of Mr. Scott, closed on the subject of the character of the deceased, kind and earnest utterance was given by the Rev. J. W. Grier, a clergyman of the Church, to the common sentiment of grief which the death of Mr. Scott had excited. The terms in which he spoke of him are described in a local newspaper as "creditable to the liberality of the preacher, honourable to the memory of the departed, and grateful to the feelings of the bereaved family."

In conclusion, it may be remarked that Mr. Scott's mental powers were characterized by vigour and soundness rather than brilliancy. With the necessary time and preparation, few men could give a more comprehensive view of a subject, or more clearly point out the best practical course. In quickness of conception and in rhetorical embellishment, many might outstrip him. What was remarkable in him was the excellent use he made of the talents and the influence which he possessed. Most instructive is the example of such a life, illustrating as it does the importance of general cultivation and religious principle, and the great results which follow a combination of moral with intellectual power.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Thomas Aikenhead: a Historical Review in relation to Mr. Macaulay and the Witness. By John Gordon. 8vo. Pp. 31. London—Whitfield. 1856.

THIS valuable pamphlet makes us first acquainted with the fact that Mr. Macaulay's graphic and pathetic narrative of the judicial murder of Thomas Aikenhead at Edinburgh in 1697, has roused attention in Scotland, and made it incumbent on those that value "orthodoxy" above mercy and Christian charity to come to the rescue, and vindicate those preachers whom the historian too truly described as "the boy's murderers."

We recently presented the story to our readers in Mr. Macaulay's words, illustrating it by notes, in which some of the authorities in support of the historian's statements were adduced. By that article it appears that Mr. Gordon's attention was drawn to at least one important part of the case, the conduct and evidence of Lorimer, who preached before the Scottish authorities between the time of Aikenhead's conviction and death.

The "Witness," an Edinburgh newspaper, has put forth a criticism on Mr. Macaulay's narrative of the case, in which the justice of his censure is denied, and an attempt is made to palliate the conduct of the Edinburgh clergy in 1697. In this juncture of the controversy, Mr. Gordon was induced to take it up, in the first instance in a lecture addressed to the members of his congregation. It was naturally desired by those who heard it that it should be printed. The result is a still more extended discussion of the subject in all its bearings in the pamphlet before us.

Possessing in the libraries of the Scottish metropolis ample materials for testing the case, Mr. Gordon has applied his analytical and powerfully logical mind to it, and we suspect that the writer in the "Witness" will now see reason for deploring the indiscretion which induced him to bring the subject before the Scottish public. Feeling as we do entire confidence in the completeness of Mr. Gordon's investigations and the good faith of his statements, we are interested to learn his impression as to the historian's accuracy. He says,

"Mr. Macaulay's representation is supported by his authorities, in every particular, and to the letter. There is not a fact, a reference, or an opinion, which he does not give with admirable correctness. All his turns of expression are answered by the documents before him. He has worked up his picture like a first-rate artist, but every stroke of it is copied from nature."—P. 17.

Mr. Gordon gives at length the statements of the "Witness," and shews most conclusively that so far as they are a reply to Mr. Macaulay, they are "an unscrupulous attempt to falsify truth and deny reality." He adds,

"I am forcibly reminded, by the manner in which the writer of this reply deals with historical documents, of the manner in which writers of his class deal with the Scriptures, and which enables them to find there anything or everything they wish to find; and I am persuaded that the theological habit thus acquired has been transferred to the circumstances before us with an unconsciousness of the light in which it would be regarded by the common honesty of the world.

"When Mr. Macaulay asserts that 'the preachers were the boy's murderers,' he means that their refusal to aid in procuring him a respite was the immediate occasion of his death. Whether they caused that death by demanding his prosecution, is a question which cannot, in the present state of our information, be decided. It is with their conduct after the prosecution that we have distinctively to do; and that conduct justifies the declaration that at his execution they 'insulted heaven with prayers more blasphemous than anything that he had uttered.' The blasphemy on their part did not consist in the profane language of their prayers, but in their petitioning for divine mercy in a case where they not only would show no mercy themselves, but had denied the opportunity, so earnestly pleaded for, by which the divine mercy might be most effectively sought. No expressions can be too strong to convey the sense of abhorrence which such conduct excites."—Pp. 17, 18.

The "Witness" describes poor Aikenhead's speech as "an extraordinary rhapsody." Mr. Gordon denies the fitness of this description, and says,

"It manifests considerable metaphysical talent, and there is no reason to doubt that the 'self-justification' it contains answered to the truth of the case. We cannot but be conciliated toward its author by such a statement as this:—

"'It was out of a pure love to truth and my own happiness that I acted; and this I proposed to myself when I was very young, as I remember about ten years of age. I have been ever, according to my capacity, searching good and sufficient grounds whereon I might safely build my faith, which at first I received *gratis dictum*.'"—P. 24.

It will be remembered that a prominent witness in the case was one Mungo Craig, who was compelled to put forth a vindication of his share in the matter. Some curious particulars respecting this person have been gathered by Mr. Gordon.

"The character displayed in that vindication is anything but creditable to him. A loud profession of religious zeal, united with an insufferable conceit, and destitute of all perception of the forbearance which common humanity would dictate, do not dispose us to place implicit trust in what he says in his own favour. Besides these drawbacks, there is also in this production a deficiency of information on certain points, the full knowledge of which is most particularly desirable. It should, moreover, be remembered that Mungo Craig had, previously to the trial, published a pamphlet under this title—*A Satyr against Atheistical Deism, with the genuine character of a Deist; to which is prefixed an account of Mr. Aikenhead's notions, who is now in prison for the same Damnable Apostacy*. The indecency of the writer of this satire appear-

ing as a witness against Aikenhead, and the suspicious nature of his whole connexion with the business, may be inferred from these atrocious lines, to which reference has already been made:—

“Come! Let a Rational and Holy flame
Of Zeal to Christ and God’s most glorious Name,
Our nation’s honour and our Christian Right,
Inspire God’s Deputies with Cœlestial Light
Who sit at Justice: That they may atone
With Blood th’ affronts of Heaven’s offended throne,
And turn away that deluge of God’s ire
Which threatens us worse than devouring fire.”—P. 25.

The “Witness” ventures to touch on the delicate topic of Calvin’s burning of Servetus, and styles it the “ONE blunder of the Genevan Reformer.” Mr. Gordon’s rebuke is powerful.

“*Blunder!* That is what we are to call any instance of malignant cruelty committed for religious ends, which attaches to the men on our side of the Catholic controversy, while we may be impelled by a holy indignation to characterize the cruelties on the other side with every opprobrious term which the *odium theologicum* can collect or invent.

“This is the orthodox rule on the subject. But it is a rule which my moral sense persuades me ought to be directly reversed.

“Protestant persecution demands a stronger condemnation than Popish persecution; because it involves a greater violation of the principles professedly held. The men who, as we are told, ‘suffered in the cause of truth and liberty,’ and yet stained that cause by inflicting upon others the sufferings against which they themselves appealed, are guilty of the *stain*, as well as of the injury. They prove that the cause of truth and liberty was with them subservient to the old hateful cause of Church domination; and in addition to whatever denunciation belongs to the latter, equally in its Protestant and Popish form, there is a deeper denunciation belonging to the disguise under which Satan endeavours here to pass himself off as ‘an angel of light.’”—P. 27.

In a Postscript, Mr. Gordon calls attention to the fact that his pamphlet does not bear the name of an Edinburgh publisher. All, under the influence of a system of ecclesiastical and clerical terrorism, refused to grant this common usage of the trade. We believe the orthodox men of Edinburgh are right as to their means, if their end be good. If Calvinistic orthodoxy is to be preserved intact, there must be no questioning of it, and no hostile criticising of its upholders and their doings allowed to appear. You cannot now burn either heretical men or their books. But you can by social persecution and unscrupulous pulpit slanders drive them out of society, ruin them in their profession or trade, and seduce the weak and faint-hearted amongst them to a dishonest conformity. You can terrify a servile race of booksellers,* and induce them to refuse their names to the title-page of a pamphlet inconveniently damaging to the clergy. Happily, this is the worst that can be done. Who can doubt that men who can do these things now, would, had they lived in darker ages, have assisted in the worst acts of persecution described in ecclesiastical history?

This publication, however put under the ban in Scotland, will have a circulation in England, and every English Unitarian reader will be pleased to think that liberal theology and free thought have so able a defender in the Scottish metropolis as Mr. Gordon.

* It is strange that such a disgrace should attach to a trade which reckons in Edinburgh such names as Constable and Black.

A Picture of a Manufacturing District. A Lecture delivered in the Town Hall, Glossop, to the Littlemoor and Howard-Town Mechanics' Institution, on Tuesday Evening, January 15th, 1856. By Edmund Potter. 8vo. Pp. 56. London—Ridgway.

ONE of the pleasant effects of our advancing civilization, of the literary cultivation of the middle classes, and of the aptitude for knowledge of the mass of the people, is the frequency in towns and villages of lectures. It is a hopeful sign of the times to see hundreds of people, the bulk of whom are labourers and mechanics, assembled to hear an address on some subject, whether it be on political economy, history, science, antiquity or topography. Good will result from the knowledge actually communicated; but there is, we believe, a higher good in the very formation of such an apparatus of civilization. The habit of meeting together for a purely intellectual purpose, the mental abstraction of the listeners, and the moral power exercised by those who are capable of discharging the functions of public instructors, are all means towards a good end. The more frequently this apparatus is used (and in proportion to the skill of those who superintend it), the greater will be the elevation and purity of public opinion and taste. Working men and their wives who have been accustomed for years to listen occasionally to scholars, gentlemen, and men of practical experience and sterling honesty, will be out of the reach of ordinary demagogues and trading orators. Mr. Potter belongs to the highest class of these public instructors. As a gentleman and a magistrate, whose aid is always liberally given to well-considered plans of usefulness, and as a capitalist and a large employer of labour, his words fall on the ears and understandings of his neighbours and workmen with authority. The lecture before us is of varied interest. As a statistical report of a manufacturing district, prepared without fear or favour, to please no patron and to serve no special theory, it is curious and valuable. As an illustration of many truths of political economy, and as containing suggestions from a shrewd practical man for the solution of many of the difficult social problems of the day, we wish this lecture may have a wide circulation. To those who, under the influence of aristocratic prejudices, or under the guidance of sentimental poets, have associated with a manufacturing district only ideas of sordid filth and coarse ignorance, the facts stated by Mr. Potter will prove matter of no little astonishment. Glossop, with its population of 21,000 persons, has an industrial population, of working men (engaged in mills, &c.) and their families, of 18,000; of farmers and quarrymen, of 600; of shopkeepers, innkeepers and their families, of about 1500; of professional men and master manufacturers, and what may be called the higher class, of 500; while the non-productive and destructive class of paupers and vagabonds amounts only to 400. This population live in 3650 homes. The number of workpeople receiving wages at factories, &c., is 9500. The weekly average of wages is £5000, giving a sum amounting to £2. 12s. 7½d. to every family of five persons, where all are productive members. The material comforts enjoyed by the people of Glossopdale have led to great improvements in their morals. The churches and chapels provide accommodation for 11,600 persons, the Establishment providing for 2750, and Dissenters for 8850! The Sunday scholars amount to 4731, the teachers to 484. For the conclusions drawn from these statistics by Mr. Potter, we must refer to the lecture itself.

INTELLIGENCE.

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

Lord John Russell has laid on the table of the House of Commons certain resolutions, the first of which he moved *pro formâ*, and then, with the permission of the House, withdrew them till the 10th of April. These resolutions are as follows :

1. That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to extend, revise and consolidate the Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council on Education.

2. That it is expedient to add to the present inspectors of schools, 80 sub-inspectors.

3. To appoint certain inspectors to the British schools, the Wesleyan and other Protestant and Catholic schools, according to the present proportion of inspectors in Church schools.

4. That, on the report of the inspectors or sub-inspectors, the Committee of Privy Council shall have power to form divisions in school districts, consisting of united parishes, a single parish, or part of a parish.

5. That the sub-inspector of schools in each division be instructed to report on the available means for the education of the poor in each school district.

6. That for the purpose of extending such means, it is expedient that the power at present possessed by the Commissioners of Charitable Trusts over certain funds be applied to the education of the middle and poorer classes.

7. That it is expedient that in any school district where the means of education from endowments, general subscriptions, or the scholars' pence, are found to be insufficient by the Committee of Education, the ratepayers shall have the power to tax themselves.

8. That after the 1st of January, 1858, on application to any quarter sessions for the county, city or borough, as the case may be, they shall be empowered to impose a school-rate.

9. That where a school-rate is imposed, a school committee to be elected by the ratepayers shall appoint the schoolmaster or schoolmistress, and make regulations for the management of the school.

10. That in every school supported in whole or in part by rates, a portion of the Holy Scriptures should be read daily, and such other provision should be made for religious instruction as the school committee should think fit, but that no

child should be compelled to receive any religious instruction or attend any religious worship to which his or her parents or guardians might, upon conscientious grounds, object.

11. That the employers of children and young persons between 9 and 15 years of age should be required to furnish certificates half-yearly of the attendance of such children and young persons at school, and to pay for such instruction.

12. That it is expedient that every encouragement should be given by prizes, by diminution of school fee, by libraries, and by other means, for the instruction of young persons between 12 and 15 years of age.

It is also understood, and taken for granted by Lord John, that a Minister of Education, with a seat in the House of Commons, is to be appointed.

Taking these resolutions seriatim, we shall make a few practical observations on them, in accordance with the educational principles uniformly advocated in the C. R., in which the right and duty of the State to educate as well as to punish has been constantly admitted and maintained, while the self-incurred difficulties (as we think them) of the Council of Education have been pointed out with deep regret year after year.

On the first resolution there can be no doubt or hesitation felt by any one who has been favoured, like ourselves, with the whole series of huge octavos which constitute the Minutes of the Committee of Council. From 1839 to 1851 inclusive (the latest in our possession being that for 1851), there are fifteen such volumes, averaging 700 or 800 pages each; the last mentioned has 1031 pages! Through these voluminous records it is almost a hopeless task to wade in search of what one wants. One may therefore doubt the need of "extending" them in point of *bulk*; and probably the resolution means merely that their *scope* be extended; while that the Minutes themselves be "revised" and "consolidated," is very obviously desirable. In a few more years the task will be as alarming as that of codifying the statutes of the realm.

The proposal to appoint eighty sub-inspectors, and some additional inspectors in chief, to map out school districts and report on the available means of education in each, will, we fear, if car-

ried, throw Mr. Baines into convulsions; even to us it seems like going very fast all at once. We do not approve of *needless* places and patronage. (Res. 2—5.)

The sixth resolution, affirming the propriety of applying the power already possessed by the Charity Commissioners over certain trust funds, to the education of the middle and poorer classes, must, in common consistency, command the support of all who voted for the Commission. But Mr. Henley already protests against such "confiscation." No details are suggested as to the proposed mode of applying such funds, whether locally or generally. Such Charity funds, we believe, are very considerable, and bear no relation whatever to local population or educational need at the present day.

The seventh takes a leaf out of the Lancashire book, by proposing to allow any district to tax itself, as Sir John Pakington's Bill of last year did. But Lord John now sees (as plainly as some of us did then) that such permissive power would be nugatory wherever "voluntaryism" is active or educational indifference prevalent. He therefore proposes, in the eighth, to give the Quarter Sessions absolute power to lay a rate, on complaint from "any person" that the means of education are inadequate in the district. And the ninth says, that where a rate has been so laid, "the ratepayers shall appoint the schoolmaster or mistress and make regulations." Shall? But suppose they won't, my Lord. You know the proverb about taking a horse to the water, but not being able to make him drink. The voluntaries will laugh at you here, as at Sir John Pakington's permissive Bill and your present seventh resolution. Yet suppose the ratepayers should proceed to make school regulations. Archdeacon Denison has already (in a letter to the *Morning Herald*) very fairly argued that school contests will supply the loss of church-rate contests where the latter shall have been extinguished by the now pending Bill.

On the tenth resolution, Lord John confesses the "religious difficulty,"—a difficulty self-imposed by the Council of Education, as we have always maintained. If the Council had bravely resolved to know nothing of religious difficulties, they might have done all they have done hitherto (which has consisted merely in helping voluntary efforts) far more simply and with more

evident impartiality than they have done. One set of inspectors might have visited all kinds of schools, without meddling with the religious instruction communicated in any. But the Council, yielding to Church clamour, first determined that in Church schools their inspectors *must* examine the religious attainments of the children (the clergy not being competent?), and then resolved that in all other schools their inspectors must be forbidden to do it; and that British schools, Methodist schools, and Roman Catholic schools, might (if they desire) each have a separate set of inspectors running over the same ground! The religious difficulty now faces us in every proposal to establish fresh schools by public rate, just as it has hitherto restrained the Council (as we have often remarked) from establishing schools of their own in poor districts where voluntary action does not take the initiative. We still believe that the plan which prevails in day-schools for the upper classes of society, where children of all religious denominations meet for secular instruction and moral training and superintendence, the distinctive religious views of their parents being reserved for instilment at home and at their churches or chapels on Sundays,—is equally applicable to the schools for the poor, for whom indeed (in our sensitive apprehension that *their* homes may be deficient in these influences) we have expressly provided religious and doctrinal and sectarian instruction in our Sunday-schools. And if we desire to reserve even the reading of the Scriptures for other times and places than the day-school, it is not from any distrust of the possibility of their being used without sectarian offence (on the true Lancasterian principle), but from a wish that the reverence due to them should not be worn out by their use as a class-book. We are willing to understand Lord John's tenth resolution as not insisting upon such a profanation of the Bible, but as being satisfied by the far preferable plan of the master reading a portion to the scholars each day.

Lord John, in that part of his speech which had reference to the tenth resolution, candidly referred to the points at issue between the Unitarians and the British and Foreign School Society. And he also fairly described the secular and moral schools of the United States, while still adhering to that unmeaning cry for "religion in schools," the only

fruit of which at present is prematurely to sectarianize the children of the poor in our large towns, and to defy the erection of schools in villages. We quote part of Lord John's speech :

He came now to the consideration of one of the most difficult parts of the measure. The Committee of Council on Education had from the first adopted the mode of investing either great societies, or persons well known for their enlarged views and character, with the task of giving religious education to the poor of their districts. In the case of Church schools, after a very considerable time spent in discussion and negotiation, it was agreed by Lord Lansdowne and others, of whom he (Lord J. Russell) was one, on the part of the Committee of Council on Education, and by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and the late Bishop of Salisbury, on the other part, that the Church schools should be open to inspection, but that the inspectors should in every case be appointed with the consent of the Archbishop or Bishop of the diocese in which the schools were situated. The inspectors so appointed took into consideration the religious as well as the secular education imparted. The British and Foreign School Society, the Wesleyans, and afterwards the Roman Catholics, demanded similar conditions, namely, that while they allowed inspection, no inspector should be appointed who was likely to be repugnant to them. But the principles of all these religious bodies were well known; and it was also known they would give religious instruction according to the tenets which they held sacred. Consequently, in handing over to them the grants which were made, and in inspecting the secular education, the Committee of the Privy Council had a full and adequate security that religious instruction would be imparted. (Hear, hear.) The House would, however, be aware that there had been a dispute between the British and Foreign School Society and the Unitarians as to their mode of teaching. The British and Foreign School Society declared from the commencement that their schools were schools for all, that they would read and teach the Bible in those schools, but that they would not adopt the formulas of any particular denomination. The Unitarians, on the other hand, contended that, in the oral instruction given, certain doctrines of Christianity were taught from which they dissented; and, therefore, the British and Foreign Society had not

carried their views of perfect equality into effect. The British and Foreign Society replied that they had only taught that which they thought was the plain meaning of the Bible lessons that were read; but, at the same time, they did teach those distinctive doctrines of the Church which separated all those bodies of Dissenters called orthodox Dissenters from the Unitarian Dissenters. In that state the case remained at present. He did not argue that the course adopted had been wisely taken; but he merely wished the House to be informed of the security which they now had, and of the plan on which the educational grants had been given. In proposing that a rate should be levied, he thought it would be quite impossible to bind the ratepayers to give the money they raised by rate either exclusively to the Church schools, or exclusively to those of any other religious denomination. There must in any case be great latitude and liberty left, and the question occurred whether any condition whatever should be imposed, and if any, what that condition should be. This was a question of the utmost gravity and importance. He was far from saying that he had arrived at any conclusion upon it, which might not be overthrown by the decision of the House. * * * The only conclusion at which he was enabled to arrive was that, the authority of the Holy Scriptures being generally acknowledged in this country, Parliament might justly say that in all the schools established by the State the Scriptures should be daily read, but that any parent who did not desire his children to receive religious instruction should be at liberty to withdraw them.

Mr. Milner Gibson plainly pointed out the weakness of the *religious* part of Lord John's scheme, and ably vindicated the secular school:

He was convinced that if they were to have a system of national education, it must be secular. He was surprised to hear the advocate of religious instruction, after censuring secular education, consent to pare down that religious instruction to such a skeleton as the mere reading of the Bible without note or comment. They seemed to be afraid of the word secular; they fancied it meant hostility to religion. They called theirs religious instruction, which, when investigated, turned out to be the mere reading of the Bible, from which any one who disliked it might withdraw. He should be glad to support any broad scheme of education founded on sound principles, but he would not be a party to any scheme which

would fasten denominational schools on the taxes of the country, and be the means of turning every parish and every district into a hotbed of religious controversy and discord. Let them separate religious from secular education—teach religion in the Sunday-school and at home, and secular education in the school. That plan was adopted at Manchester with success.

To the eleventh resolution we cannot object. It is the extension of the principle now applied to children working in factories, which ought equally to be applied to children whose parents are tempted by any other kind of work to sacrifice their school instruction. The payment by the employers, of course, would be stopped out of the wages.

And the twelfth, evidently meant as an effort to check the sadly premature removal of children from school, can do no harm, though we are not sanguine of its good.

On the whole, we do not augur great results from these resolutions, even if they should pass the House.

CHURCH-RATES.

There are now before the House of Commons virtually three schemes for dealing with this question. We wish we could think any one of them would secure its satisfactory settlement.

The Bill of Mr. Packe and the Marquis of Blandford proposes to limit church-rates to the maintenance and repair of the fabric of the church, and the supply and renewal of the necessary fittings of the church;—the expression “fittings” being meant to include only pews, seats, reading-desk, pulpits, bells and bell-ropes. In case of vestry refusing to make a rate, the Court of Queen’s Bench shall have power to order one. The rate,—assessed, levied and recoverable in the same manner as the poor-rate,—is to be charged on the occupier, who shall deduct the amount from the rent payable to his landlord. By a simple prescribed process, the freeholder may redeem his lands, &c. from church-rate. The moneys so paid to be invested in the public funds, and the interest accruing to be annually paid to the churchwardens of the parish in which the property thus redeemed is situate.

The plan here propounded has the recommendation of simplicity and completeness. Its limitation of the objects to which church-rates shall be applied, is a great improvement on the existing

system, and would reduce the gross annual amount now raised, probably, more than one-half. The Bill makes no provision for the ordinary expenses of divine worship, which, in its own way, of course every congregation would have to defray for itself. Why, except to avoid all chance of opposition, the landlord, rather than the occupier, should be made to bear the burthen, we do not quite understand. Landlords, generally, would form but a small minority of the vestry—in that character, have no right even to be present: though the parties chiefly interested, they could exercise hardly any control over the expenditure; while the occupiers, who might legally, would be deprived of all motive to do so, by their non-liability to pay.

The Bill introduced by Sir William Clay, in conjunction with Mr. Hutt and Mr. Miall, proposes absolutely to abolish church-rates, and, it professes, “to make other provision in lieu thereof.” This “other provision” is by declaring it lawful for churchwardens to receive voluntary contributions for the purposes to which church-rates are usually applied. No disbursement of moneys thus obtained is to be allowed without the approval of auditors, five of whom are to be annually appointed by the vestry of every parish, and whose qualification shall be that they are owners or occupiers of pews or seats in the parish church, or are communicants of the church. Churchwardens are to present to these auditors a statement of their receipts and expenditure, which, when approved, is to be signed by them, and to be open to the inspection of parishioners. If any dispute arise between churchwardens and auditors, the “ordinary or his official” is to be called in, and his decision to be final.

All the clauses of this Bill, beyond the first, appear to us just so much surplusage, of which Churchmen have some reason to complain. As Dissenters, we entirely disclaim any right to interfere, whether as members of a vestry or by auditors appointed by us, with the voluntary contributions of others. What Churchmen voluntarily raise, Churchmen may surely fairly ask to be allowed to spend, without being accountable to those who contribute not a single farthing. To concede to members of the Church, by formal legislative enactment, the right to make “voluntary contributions” for their own religious wants, strikes us as

something like a burlesque on legislation; while to allow others, not of their communion, to interfere, directly or indirectly, with the way in which such contributions are spent, would be to reduce Churchmen a little below that "religious equality" for which Dissenters contend so stoutly for themselves.

On Wednesday, March 5, in a full House, the second reading of this Bill was carried by a majority of 43, the numbers being 221 for, and 178 against it. This result was brought about by the Government, the members of which, after intimating their intention of proposing various amendments in Committee, voted in favour of the Bill. These amendments have since been printed, and, if adopted, will materially change the character of the measure.

Instead of entire abolition, the Government propose to limit it to parishes in which no church-rate has been made for five years; and, after the passing of the Act, to places where a vestry shall refuse a rate, and no rate be made for two years. In addition to this, there is provision for relieving objectors in parishes where the rate may be continued, by exempting from its payment every one who may choose to declare in writing—"I am not a member of the Church of England;" the names of persons so declaring to be registered by the churchwarden, and they disentitled from voting in vestry on any question concerning church-rates. In parishes in which church-rates cease, the incumbent and churchwardens, with consent of ordinary, are to have power to let pews and sittings, and apply the rents towards defraying expenses now met by a rate. Rent-charges may also be given, by will or otherwise, for ordinary church-rate purposes, provided they do not exceed, to any one church, the yearly sum of £100.

These amendments, it will be seen, are, to a great extent, based upon the Bill introduced last year by the Archbishop of Canterbury, under the protection of whose wing the Government are evidently very glad to place themselves. To all charges of surrendering the fair rights of the Church, it is so convenient to be able to refer to the measure of his Grace! The only telling point in Lord Palmerston's reply to the damaging speech of Lord John Russell was the taunt—"Why, my noble friend is more of a Churchman than even the Heads of the Church!"

The good Archbishop must prepare for such a storm of invective as probably never assailed him before. Amiable and pliable as we fancy him to be, we shall not much wonder if his unscrupulous and apparently nettled brother of Exeter frighten him into a surrender of his own scheme, and thus deprive the Government of a shield which to them must be of so much value.

Whatever Churchmen may say, Dissenters, we think, can hardly complain of any want of liberality on the part of the Government in meeting their objections. This measure carried, the Church would really in future have to trust to the attachment and voluntary support of its own members. Disliking patch-work legislation, we should prefer a settlement of this difficult question on some simpler principle, uniform and general in its application; and for this object might, individually, be disposed to concede something to the claims of the Church. With all our objections to the existing Ecclesiastical Establishment, we cannot but regard it as an instrument of unquestionable social good, of which we should much regret to see our poorer population deprived. Our parish churches are the property of the nation, not of a sect. We desire that the nation should retain its unfettered hold upon and interest in them. Is there no mode of making the national revenues of the Church applicable to the sustentation of the buildings of the Church? That is the kind of church-rate settlement we should like to see. If that ever-recurring obstruction in the way of social progress, "vested interests," render this at present impracticable, we venture to think—speaking only for ourselves—that, by a machinery much more simple than is now employed, upon the nation might be thrown the mere preservation of our parish churches, at a cost so trifling that it could hardly be felt by either the conscience or the pocket of the most scrupulous.

MANCHESTER DISTRICT SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this useful Society was held on Good Friday at Manchester. The religious service was conducted in Cross-Street chapel, and the fineness of the day and the fame of the preacher contributed to swell the number of the congregation assembled. The fine and spacious chapel was well

filled by hearers from many places in the two counties of Lancaster and Chester, and by some from even more distant places. The preacher was the Rev. W. H. Channing, of America and Liverpool. He took for his text Matt. xviii. 10, "In heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." The preacher described his text as expressive (as the whole transaction of Christ's blessing the children was a type) of the attitude in which the Christian church should stand towards the young. We believe we should do injustice to the remarkable discourse delivered by the preacher, and should certainly give no adequate impression of the effect it produced on those who heard it, if we were to give a mere skeleton outline of it. In the early portions, the views of the preacher were somewhat transcendental. But a beautiful spirit of faith, hope and charity pervaded every part of the sermon. The closing portions were simple and practical, and were acceptable and interesting to those whose want of idealism prevented their intelligent acceptance of the earlier portions of the discourse. At the close of the service, those who came from a distance, accompanied by some Manchester friends, went to the school-buildings in Lower Mosley Street. In the upper room, about 200 partook of an excellent cold dinner, supplied at a very low charge. At two o'clock, the business meeting of the Society was formed. There was a very numerous assemblage of teachers and friends. Amongst them were Mr. J. Heywood, M.P., Mr. Samuel Robinson, Mr. T. Wright, the benevolent prison philanthropist, Mr. J. C. Lawrence, of London, Rev. John Wright, Rev. John Cropper, Rev. L. Taplin, Dr. Bateman, &c. &c. The chair was taken by Mr. C. J. Herford, who opened the proceedings by a few appropriate remarks, and particularly regretted the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents, a circumstance which occasioned his taking the chair.

The Committee's report, which was read by Mr. Jeffrey Worthington, one of the Secretaries, congratulated the members on the general state of the Association. If the statistical returns prepared shewed some features of improvement, they also shewed that there was still room for increased energy. No new publications had been issued during the year. The Sunday-School Magazine continues to be the means of

much good, and no effort ought to be spared to maintain its efficiency. The balance-sheet for the year, notwithstanding a sale of 60,437 single numbers and 236 volumes during the twelve months, is not favourable. This is owing to the high price of paper and to a diminished sale, chiefly in Manchester and the neighbourhood, doubtless the result of high prices and bad times. The visiting of the schools has been in active operation by the agency of Messrs. Broom, Curtis and Freeston. Mr. Broom has paid forty-eight visits during the year. At Bury, he states that the school exhibits a marked improvement as respects the number of scholars and teachers, and also the general discipline. It is now one of the best appointed of our schools. At Congleton also the school is greatly improved, in great part owing to the efforts of the Association's Visitor. At Macclesfield, an unfortunate dispute has led to the secession of most of the teachers. They have opened a new school, which is carried on without any spirit of rivalry towards the parent institution, and now numbers 134 scholars, many of them not previously attendants on any school. At Padiham, the school is greatly increased, and a new school-house is needed. A Sunday-school has recently been opened at Cross Street, in Cheshire. It has been visited by Mr. Broom, and is doing well. The system of visitation has produced great benefit, by enabling the agents of the Association to set before the teachers what experience has proved in other institutions to be serviceable. It also enables the Committee to know where books and other help are specially needed, and where, consequently, free grants will be most valuable. The Committee regret that since Christmas Mr. Broom has been compelled, by duties temporarily undertaken in connection with the Manchester Domestic Mission, to suspend his visits. Mr. Freeston's services have been in the mean time employed. The conferences of Sunday-school directors have been regularly held and with good results. A proposal for the establishment of a teachers' library is still under consideration. The report concluded with an expression of the anxiety of the Committee to receive, from all available quarters, useful suggestions. They wished to be chiefly regarded as the central channel through which the united efforts of the supporters of the schools in the district might be directed.

Mr. Freeston then presented the statistical table of the schools in connection with the Society. It shewed an increase of both scholars and teachers, but particularly of the latter, in the aggregate of the schools. It contained a list of the kindred institutions of the several schools. We can only give the numbers of scholars and teachers in each of the schools. By comparing it with a similar document given in our pages in previous years, it will be seen that the majority of the schools are increasing in the means of usefulness, that several maintain their former position, while a few are, from accidental circumstances, slightly on the decline.

	Teachers.	Scholars.
Ainsworth.....	32	205
Altringham.....	6	49
Bolton.....	97	192
Bury.....	47	290
Chowbent.....	46	229
Congleton.....	11	79
Croft.....	4	18
Dean Row.....	4	39
Dob Lane.....	34	124
Dukinfield.....	70	492
„ Astley Street	24	94
Flowers Field.....	85	398
Gee Cross.....	66	187
Hale.....	12	40
Hindley.....	(no report)	
Hurst Brook.....	29	110
Knutsford.....	7	53
Liverpool, Hope Street	24	129
„ Renshaw Street.	30	115
„ Domestic Mission	15	180
Macclesfield:		
King Edward Street	(no report)	
Commercial Road..	22	129
Manchester:		
Lower Mosley St...	73	516
New Bridge Street	29	232
Domestic Mission..	26	184
Monton.....	29	113
Mossley.....	136	954
Mottram.....	61	299
Newchurch.....	47	218
Oldham.....	13	96
Padiham.....	69	286
Park Lane.....	6	89
Rawtenstall.....	16	130
Rivington.....	4	29
Rochdale.....	26	130
Stand.....	37	182
Stockport.....	19	158
Styal.....	14	113
Swinton.....	12	66
Todmorden.....	29	123
Warrington.....	17	150
Making a total in the 38 schools which have sent reports of 1316 teachers and 7820 scholars. Last year, 40 schools		

sent in returns, which gave totals of 1218 teachers and 7190 scholars; thus shewing a considerable increase in the present year. The returns for 38 schools which had sent them in both years were—last year, 1177 teachers and 6886 scholars; this year, 1316 teachers and 7820 scholars; shewing an increase of 139 teachers and 934 scholars.

Mr. Curtis, the Treasurer, presented the financial report, which shewed a balance of £28 in the bank.

Rev. John Wright, in moving the adoption of the reports, congratulated the Association on meeting under peculiarly favourable circumstances. They had assembled in a central position, enabling many friends to attend. They had been favoured by the public services of a gentleman whose name and eminent reputation were sure to attract, and whose spoken words would doubtless both interest and do good. They were also favoured by the presence of a greater number of friends than on any previous occasion. After remarking on several features of the reports, the speaker said he was strongly impressed with one thing—that one of the principal means of usefulness in the hands of the Society was the regular visitation of the schools. This impression was strongly confirmed by the recorded experience of the past year. The subject of the Sunday-School Magazine, referred to by the Committee, was one of great interest to him. The report scarcely described the perilous condition of the work in terms as strong as he should feel disposed to use. Unless an early change took place, it would be absolutely necessary at the close of the present year to discontinue the Magazine. He spoke plainly because he did not wish the members of the Association to be taken by surprise. The loss was nearly £30 during the last year. The reasons assigned in the report were substantially correct. A diminution of 750 per month in the circulation had taken place. A periodical with a circulation still amounting to 5000 per month ought to command remunerative advertisements; but then booksellers and others knew that their work did not circulate amongst the book-buying class.

Mr. James Robinson, of Mossley, seconded the motion, and gave some interesting particulars of the schools at Mossley. They commenced their work with trembling hearts four years ago; now they had upwards of 900 scholars, and might have a still larger

number if their rooms were capable of receiving more. Their school was every year becoming more efficient. They were now beginning to receive the assistance of those who had been trained in the schools, and who, in addition to the knowledge of their routine system, were penetrated by a strong personal feeling binding them to the institution.

A Teacher from Bradford, who described himself as a working man, expressed his warm interest in the Sunday-School Magazine, and his earnest hope that it would not be allowed to drop. Let others do what he did sometimes—buy half-a-dozen numbers of the Magazine, and give them to deserving children. They received the present with gratitude, and were often induced to become subscribers on their own account.

Rev. Alfred Worthington suggested that, rather than abandon so useful a work as the Magazine, as it proved that they were giving more than a penny-worth for a penny, they should contract its size.

Rev. R. Brook Aspland dwelt on the very encouraging character of the returns handed in from the schools. In the majority of the returns there was an increase of the number of scholars or teachers, or in both. The increase of teachers was particularly satisfactory. The report from Mossley was very animating. During the past year they had been exposed to extraordinary competition. A splendid chapel and capacious school-rooms had been opened by their brethren the Independents, which were, it was said, to empty the chapel and school-rooms of the Christian Brethren. But the result was an increase of the scholars and teachers on their previous very large numbers. He trusted the note of alarm sounded respecting the Magazine would be the means of saving it. An acceptable Magazine, with a circulation of 5000 per month, was a means of influence not to be lightly surrendered. The times had been very unpropitious to all periodical literature, but he believed a brighter day was dawning upon the country and the world, and that prosperity would presently return. Let a subscription, if necessary, be made to tide the Magazine over its temporary difficulty—let a canvas be made in every school for new subscribers—and he could not doubt that next year the report respecting the Magazine would be as cheerful as this year it was gloomy.

After some remarks from Mr. S. Robinson and the Chairman, the resolution was put and carried unanimously.

Mr. James Heywood, M.P., then moved thanks to the officers of the Association, and the names of the officers for the ensuing year. In doing so, he expressed his interest in the work the Society was doing. It seemed to be a kind of voluntary effort at centralization. The Committee of the Privy Council did not attempt to touch Sunday-schools. The Association was in its district doing with respect to Sunday-schools what the Privy-Council Committee of Education did with respect to other schools. Their plan of inspection had his hearty approbation. It was always found most serviceable. He was glad to find that the operations of their Society had been carried on with so much judgment and success. The resolution was seconded and carried unanimously.

Rev. Henry Green and Rev. John Davis moved and seconded a vote, which was also adopted, acknowledging the hospitable reception of the Association by the Manchester friends.

Rev. John Cropper said that it was one of the gratifying features of that interesting meeting, that they were favoured with the presence of a representative of and delegate from the Sunday-School Association in London. The gentleman who appeared amongst them that day was a worthy son of a most worthy father, Mr. J. C. Lawrence, a son of the excellent Alderman Lawrence, of whom they had read so interesting a memoir lately in the pages of the Christian Reformer. He moved a vote of welcome to Mr. Lawrence. Before sitting down, he made some touching remarks upon the means of keeping the elder scholars in connection with our religious societies.

Rev. M. C. Frankland, in seconding the vote, spoke of the usefulness of the Sunday-School Society of which Mr. Lawrence appeared as the representative. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Mr. J. C. Lawrence expressed his acknowledgment of the kind reception that had been given him, and remarked that the Sunday-School Association, which he represented on that occasion, could not regard with indifference the operations of any of the District or Branch Societies, and had watched with deep interest the proceedings of the District Society of Manchester, where not only educational, but all

philanthropic, objects were pursued with so much energy and zeal as to offer an example to the rest of England. Some fears had been expressed when the District Society was formed, lest that very energy should carry them away from their original plans, and cause them to forget the objects for which the Manchester Society had been formed. He had not shared in those fears, because he felt that by the vigour of local managers the interests and progress of the Central Society would be best promoted. On referring to their Rules, he found that one of their objects was not only to co-operate with the Sunday-School Association, but to carry out its plans in the neighbourhood more, and extend its means of usefulness. Now he thought this had been in a great measure lost sight of, and there were even signs of a disposition to ignore the Central Association entirely. He trusted that one result of his visit to Manchester would be a thorough understanding of the relations the Manchester District Society would in future bear to the Sunday-School Association. There was ample work to be done in the neighbourhood of Manchester in the management and improvement of their schools. No one could do this so well as themselves; but with respect to publishing, he thought the District Society had not done any good by engaging in it. The multiplication of Publishing Societies was an unmixed evil; it absorbed effort which might be better employed, raised the price of books, and created amongst them division and dissension. He did not think it right to conceal from the meeting that from this cause there was not so much cordiality between the two Societies as ought to prevail, and he would submit to Mr. Wright whether this might not be one of the causes of the diminution in the sale of the Magazine. He thought they could be scarcely aware of the facts which had induced the Sunday-School Association to send a deputation to Manchester. In the first place, the whole of the subscriptions from Manchester had been withdrawn during the past year. Secondly, many of the schools had declined to send returns of their numbers, so that the statistical account of the whole of England was necessarily imperfect: and, lastly, the publication of a new Hymn-book having been announced, the Manchester agent had returned the greater part of the publications of the Association,

stating he had little demand for them. Now, considering that the sale of the Association Hymn-book had exceeded 20,000, he did think that the Manchester Society should have hesitated before introducing another and an inferior one in opposition to it, especially as the report just read shewed how slight had been the demand for another Hymn-book. Mr. Lawrence concluded by expressing his earnest hope that the result of his visit would be, not only to remove any misunderstanding that might have prevailed, but that his report to the Sunday-School Association might lead to the restoration of perfect harmony, and tend to further the great objects they all had in view,—the improvement and extension of Sunday-school education.

Rev. John Wright, in reply, said that the Manchester Association had no wish whatever to interfere with the Sunday-School Society; that they had printed no one book that was calculated to interfere with the existing publications of their friends in London; that, before beginning the Magazine, they had asked whether such a work, which was much needed, was likely to be undertaken in London, and were assured there was no thought of such a work. The Manchester Society had published no Hymn-book, but had partially adopted one printed at Norwich. While disclaiming all intentional opposition, Mr. Wright claimed for the Manchester Association the right of independent action.—The subject was further pursued by Mr. Heywood, Rev H. Green, and others.

Rev. T. E. Poynting proposed in glowing terms a vote of acknowledgment to Mr. Channing for the noble discourse of the morning. The resolution was seconded by Mr. S. Robinson, supported by Rev. Charles Beard, and carried by acclamation.

A letter was then read from Mr. William Simons, White Hart Lane, Tottenham, London, proposing to make provision for the training, &c. of all orphans by the contributions of Sunday-school teachers and scholars. The teachers, it was said, had the opportunity of selecting the objects for such beneficence from amongst the scholars; and a subscription of 1s. per annum from each teacher and 1d. from each scholar, would raise £26,000, enough to maintain from 1700 to 1800 orphans; and if, instead of one shilling a-year, a penny a-week were given by each teacher, from £75,000 to £80,000 would

be raised. The writer suggested that the teachers of the Unitarian body should take the initiative in the matter. After some remarks by Mr. Thomas Wright, the prison philanthropist, the letter was referred to the Committee for their early consideration; and the meeting terminated with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

The friends then returned to the upper school-room, where tea was prepared. The social meal was partaken of by several hundred persons, and as soon as the tables were cleared the chair for the evening meeting was taken by Mr. James Heywood, M.P. Of the excellent speeches delivered by him, Rev. W. H. Channing, Mr. Lawrence, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Rev. W. Crosskey and Rev. Charles Beard, we

are forbidden by our exhausted space to attempt to report, as well as of the able address prepared and read by Mr. H. Rawson, on the best mode of communicating Religious Instruction in our Schools.

It was resolved that the meeting next year should be held at Gee Cross and Flowery Field; the religious service to take place at the chapel at the former place, and the subsequent meetings to be held in the spacious school-rooms of the Messrs. Ashton of Flowery Field. After a cordial vote of thanks to the Chairman, the diversified and deeply interesting proceedings were brought to a close, and distant friends hastened to return home by their several trains, grateful for the enjoyment of a truly Christian day.

OBITUARY.

Nov. 5, at Colyton cottage, Colyton, Devon, GEORGE EYRE POWELL, Esq., commander in the Royal Navy, aged 65. The subject of this notice was born in 1790, and was the fifth son of the late Eyre Powell, Esq., of Great Connel, Kildare, Ireland. At the early age of sixteen, he entered the service, and in subsequent years distinguished himself in several expeditions and engagements. On one occasion he was taken prisoner by the French, who marched him across the Alps to Briançon and Verdun, where he and his companions were confined. His valorous and persevering spirit could not brook the ennui of a French prison, and in a short time he made his escape, with two of his fellow-officers, and for days suffered great privations, when their little fishing-boat, in which they braved the deep, was fortunately hailed by an English cutter and brought to England. He continued in active service until 1823, and for seventeen years was unemployed. This leisure had its value. A young family claimed his attention, and he sought a quiet retreat in Devon, where he planted a home for all the kindly social affections. Though trained to a seafaring life, and having mixed in all its hardships and gaieties, he had the manliness and good resolve to cast them off for more tender cares and higher efforts. He had the righteous purpose to make his home, what every home ought to be, a *Christian home*. Happily united to one who had enjoyed the religious teachings and counsels of

Kenrick and Carpenter, a lady of deep religious convictions and feelings, his mind was not only rightfully influenced, but was soon found co-operating with hers in giving the children the true pleasures and instructions of a religious home. Such domestic affection and discipline, moral and religious training, were not fruitless. They were strikingly evinced in his only son, a youth of great promise, who was suddenly cut off while preparing for the legal profession. This was a most painful stroke, leaving a dark and melancholy void in the happy circle. Our friend believed and trusted, and though cast down at his sore bereavement, he breathed his aspirations to heaven, saying, in the words of Jesus, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." He had several daughters left, who are still living witnesses to a good father's affection and care. His devotedness to his family and his love for retirement made him reluctant to engage in any public duties save those of religion. Within the last few years, however, his fellow-townsmen, who always held him in high esteem, had the pleasure of seeing him come forward to aid them by his presence and counsel in every plan for the improvement of the town and people, especially of the humbler classes. His influence was producing a vast social good over the little community of Colyton. He not only presided at all their public meet-

ings, but the opinion of the "good Captain," as he was called, was listened to with the profoundest attention and respect. In the midst of much public usefulness, he was suddenly cut off. The day before his decease, he complained of not feeling so well as usual, and his family deemed it needful to send for his medical adviser, who saw no ground for alarm, but recommended him to keep in bed until he saw him the next day. When the morning arrived, the Captain thought himself better, and had given instructions respecting a public meeting. It was his last utterance, for in a few minutes afterwards, a member of his family on approaching his room found that the vital spark had fled. No words can describe the gloom and sorrow which pervaded the whole town and neighbourhood when it was known that the good Captain was no more. His old friend and former pastor, the Rev. James Taplin, of Tavistock, discharged the solemn duties at the grave. His remains were followed to their last resting-place by a vast number of persons of all ranks and opinions, from the first noblemen of the neighbourhood to the humblest labourer of the town. It was a novel but most pleasing sight to see, on one side of the officiating minister, the clergyman of the Episcopal Church, and, on the other, the pastor of the Independent church. On the subsequent sabbath, Mr. Taplin preached the funeral sermon to a crowded house, taking his text from Job vii. part of the 26th ver., Matt. xi. 26. "Thou shalt seek me in the morning, but I shall not be." "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." The preacher, in conclusion, observed, that while the awful solemnity of death forbade eulogy, he presumed it might not be unprofitable to recal a few of the impressions left on his mind by his long friendship with the departed, and to portray some of the good lessons of the scriptural image then in their midst. He had been a pillar of strength to the congregation he was addressing, by his example of high integrity, fervent piety and Christian usefulness. His warm affections and quick sympathies rendered him ever ready to aid those who needed. His sympathies embraced all orders of men. He had a general respect for human nature in every form, as many a widowed mother could testify in her boy that he had cared for, and in the letter which he had often

indited for her aid and comfort. While many hearts were touched with sadness at his loss, what must be their sorrow to whom he was bound by the closest ties, — the heart that for so many years shared his joys and trials, and attended with faithful watchfulness his last hour, and the loved ones that were a comfort and a blessing to him? The preacher commended them to the God of all peace and consolation, and trusted, that, while they mourned the loss of a parent so useful and dear, they would cherish the memory of his virtues by copying them, and, clinging to the precious hope of immortality, send their thoughts forward to that eternal day when they should meet again to part never.

Feb. 5, in her 81st year, at Elmfield House, Huddersfield, MARY BYTHEWOOD KELL, daughter of Mr. Thomas Delacourt, of Wareham, and relict of the late Rev. Robert Kell, of Birmingham. She was descended from a long line of friends of civil and religious liberty, and was herself deeply imbued with the same spirit. Without referring to those of modern times who were identified with the support of the Dissenting interest at Wareham, it may be noticed that one of her ancestors was confined in the adjacent Corfe Castle in the reign of Charles the First, for being a suspected and troublesome character. Of another, various anecdotes worthy of record have been transmitted in the family. In the days of James the Second, it was Thomas Delacourt who took down in the night the heads of four victims of the inhuman Jeffries from the Town Hall at Wareham, and hid them under the mattress of his bed. Falling under the suspicion of his persecutors, his house was searched, but happily his bed was not subjected to examination; and having thus escaped detection, he buried the heads the following morning. He was brought before a Justice of the Peace on the charge of harbouring suspected people in his house. "You keep a conventicle," said his worship. Being answered in the negative, he asked, "If neighbours So-and-so were not with him at such a time, and if they did not pray together?" Thomas Delacourt answered, like Joshua of old, "I do and will 'serve the Lord.' I will bow the knee to God night and morning. And if I give to my neighbour a part of my bread and cheese, why may I not offer him a part of the bread of life?"

The answer was not satisfactory, and Delacourt was fined. The righteous man had furniture, but he had no cash. His goods were accordingly brought to the market-place to be sold. To the honour of the town, not an article was purchased. The following day another effort for sale was made, with the same result, the inhabitants seeming to think that the displeasure of Heaven would visit them if they touched the unhallowed spoils of persecution. At length the Justice was obliged to *restore* all he had seized, "bed, bolster and mattress." Soon after this, Delacourt happened to be standing at the door of an inn, when a tall soldier, arrayed in large jack-boots, heavy sword, and all the formidable armour of 1670, accosted him. On learning his name, the trooper drew his sword and plunged it into Delacourt's body. But the wound was not mortal, and Delacourt succeeded in wresting the sword out of the aggressor's hand, snapped it in pieces, knocked the man down, and fled into an adjoining wood, where he remained until his wound was healed. His persecutions from tyranny ceased only at the Revolution under King William, whom he met at Torbay, marching by his side to London.*

The character of Mrs. Kell was

* The following is the inscription on his tomb :

In memory of
THOMAS DELACOURT,

A humble Christian but an inflexible
Patriot.

He intrepidly resisted the infringements made by James II. on Liberty, Civil and Religious.

His house was denounced as a Conventicle, his Goods were seized and twice exposed to sale at the Cross, but

Not a Single Purchaser appeared.
At the imminent risque of his life, he removed in the dead of night the heads of
Captain Tyler, Mr. Matthews, and

Mr. Halway,
From the town hall, who had been condemned by Judge Jeffries
To suffer martyrdom for their adherence to
Primitive Christianity.

He secreted them under his own bed, and afterwards

Interred them under the South-eastern
Walls.

He narrowly escaped assassination at the
Bull Inn, Wareham,

For his loyal attachment to those principles which seated the House of Brunswick on the Throne.

marked by great decision, mingled with habitual kindness and courtesy. She had twelve children, ten of whom lived to maturity; all, with the exception of one, were married. Until the family grew up, the Rev. Robert Kell was not only the Christian pastor, but conducted a large boarding-school; and it was a striking proof of her untiring energy, that while assiduously discharging the duties of a mother and the domestic responsibilities of the establishment (as many of the scholars in after years often tenderly and gratefully remembered), she also materially aided her beloved husband in the pastoral labours of a large congregation, especially among the sick and poor,—a loving practice which, in another pastorate, she continued to the close of life. On becoming a widow, she removed from Birmingham to Huddersfield, where many of her children lived, and became there one of the founders of the Unitarian church, by the members of which she was so universally esteemed, that at her interment they attended in a body, forming a line at the entrance of the cemetery chapel for the funeral procession to pass through. Her sympathies were naturally strong with the oft arduous labours of Unitarian ministers. She was ever solicitous that they should be treated with that affectionate respect which is essential to the welfare of their flocks, and was never so happy as when her house was their home. It is hardly possible for the children of such a parent to speak how much they venerated and loved her. "She opened her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue was the law of kindness. They rose up and called her blessed." (Prov. xxxi. 26—28.) She was the bond of their union, the cement of their affection, whose warm love all shared and returned, to

He voluntarily bore an active part in the glorious Revolution of 1688.

On his road to join King William at Torbay, he was basely betrayed by an associate at Honiton, but eagerly grasping his sword, he successfully bade defiance to his pursuers.

He stood sentinel over the Bloody Jeffries in the Tower of London.

And after having seen the Constitution of England placed

On its Present Happy Basis,
Died in peace in this town, aged 84, 1733,
exclaiming,

"Come, Lord Jesus, Come Quickly."
Wareham.

whose counsel all gave heed. In the formation of the religious tone of her character, she was another instance of the advantage of early religious training, and of storing the mind with devotional poetry. A large number of favourite hymns were fixed in her memory, and were the food of her chosen thoughts in the season of nature's decline. In her last illness she repeated to the writer with touching emphasis one of Dr. Watts' sacred lyrics, which she had been wont to recite when a child of five years old, seated on the knee of the Rev. Francis Webb, who then resided in the neighbourhood of Wareham. The last lines she quoted before falling into that sleep from which she never waked were—

"Come, let us join our cheerful songs
With angels round the throne:
Ten thousand thousand are their tongues,
But all their joys are one;"

saying to her nurse, "These words ought to be sung in every cottage of the land."

Her life, chequered as it was with much incident, and often tasked to great effort and self-sacrifice, was a happy one. She has been heard to say "that she rarely passed a day she would not have been willing to live over again." And during her illness she gratefully and emphatically said, "My Father has been very kind to me." An affecting funeral sermon, which drew together a large congregation, was preached by the Rev. J. K. Montgomery, from 1 Cor. xv. 57, 58, the insertion of a portion of which he has kindly permitted.

"By natural constitution perhaps, and certainly by early culture, our departed valued friend was strongly imbued with religious feeling and sentiment and principles. Of their character I may presently speak more at large. From earliest years surrounded by religious influences, as her whole tone of thought and expression indicated, and from an early period, as the wife of a Christian minister, still more deeply interested in and closely identified with religious institutions and ministrations, she had a deep sense of the value and importance, personally and for all, but more especially for the young, of public worship. It was in truth, as it ever is to the truly Christian mind, a want of her spiritual nature, as much as the intercourse of society was of her social nature. And many of us know how truly she enjoyed and how much she

enlivened and adorned the social circle by her genial presence.

"When circumstances and the providence of God cast her lot in this community, finding no religious services of that liberal character which was most congenial to her Christian faith, and with which the associations of a long and active life had been so peculiarly identified elsewhere, she neither, as many might have done, on the one hand, wholly neglected public worship because that which was altogether congenial to her tastes and feelings could not be enjoyed; nor on the other, as too many, through indifference, cast herself into the current of popular worship, satisfied with mere conformity to its outward observance, in the absence of sympathy of spirit, so essential to social worship. Her associations and views and principles had from early life been Nonconformist and Unitarian, and she was imbued with much of the Puritan love of the simplest forms of worship, yet without one particle of the Puritan sternness of spirit. So long as there were none entirely congenial to her views and feelings, during the first years of her residence in this town, she was a frequent, if not regular, attendant on the religious ministry of the truly liberal and Christian-minded predecessor of the present minister of Highfield chapel. Yet she too strongly cherished and too sincerely valued the simpler truths and more cheerful views of Christianity cherished from early life, to be satisfied with that qualified sympathy, arising more out of the character of the preacher than the principles and views of the church she thus attended. And unable to impart, it may be, even the measure of her own sympathy to others whose religious culture was ever the object of her solicitude, she still clung to the hope, and relaxed no effort for its realization, of establishing a society for the simple and spiritual worship of 'One God the Father,' and for the diffusion in the community, whilst fostering in its own members, especially those she loved, of those distinctively Christian, yet more catholic and cheerful and benign views of God and Christianity, which were the characteristics of her own faith.

"The aged head of a large domestic circle, with children of the third generation growing up around her, her great anxiety was to see established religious services that should win the sympathies and minister to the religious culture of those whose every want was the object of her constant care, and the formation of whose religious principles and Christian

character was one of the strongest desires of her heart. She who had so religiously trained one generation, could not bear that children's children should be without the religious influences and associations so precious to herself. Her desires and efforts, as already said, to establish a Unitarian society in this place, where none had ever yet taken root, were nobly seconded and aided by others; and the early result was even greater than was anticipated. And it was to her, who is no longer amongst us, a day of devout gratitude and unspeakable joy when the nucleus of our present congregation assembled for the first time, and in an upper room, for Unitarian worship,—the worship in spirit and in truth of the Father, as disciples of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. In all our congregational affairs and institutions she ever took the liveliest interest; and its welfare and success have been largely promoted, notwithstanding her advanced age, by her personal efforts and counsel, and her friendly intercourse with its members of every station. Feeling its importance, she was always interested in congregational visiting; and her cheerful countenance and kindly words were no strangers in many of your homes and hearts. And in this way, aided by those around her, of whom I may not speak in this place, have the interests and prosperity of the congregation been how largely promoted, none know better than I, and none more readily acknowledge, whatever feeling of personal shortcomings it may involve.

"Her anxiety for its permanent establishment increased with her increasing years, as she felt that at her advanced age she could not hope long to be permitted to exercise any personal influence or put forth personal labour even for an end so dear to her. That duty, fellow-Christians, is her dying legacy to you, and especially to those of you who were near and dear to her. I have no fear of its remaining unfulfilled. I shall never forget her anxiety during the years when the building of this place, our first permanent church, was in contemplation and in progress. With most of us, she felt how important was the step. And touchingly at times did she express to me her fears lest she should not live to witness its completion, and yet her strong desire to be so permitted of God. Her desire was granted; and she was grateful for the blessing. At its dedication there was in no heart deeper gratitude or more devout rejoicing. Neither inclemency of weather nor the state of the new building could deter her from attending its opening services; and

she was present at no little risk of health. And till her latest illness, which at first we little thought would be her last, alike her undiminished interest in the congregation, and her strong sense of the duty and importance of public worship, were how truly attested by her regular attendance on the service of this house of prayer. And as a testimony to her religiousness of spirit, and as an example to all, and worthy of all imitation, let it be told of her, that never since the formation of this society was she ever absent, on any ground save the requirements of health, from a single service of its public worship."

EDMUND KELL.

February 7, at his residence, Fairfield, Glasnevin, near Dublin, the Rev. JOSEPH HUTTON, A.M., aged 90 years. He was the youngest and last-surviving son of Robert Hutton, a highly respected citizen of Dublin, several of whose descendants, of more than one generation, have proved themselves worthy of their "fair descent" from him. Having at an early age freely chosen the profession of the Christian ministry, the subject of this brief memorial received a classical education, under well-qualified instructors, in his native city, and took the degree of A.B., and subsequently that of A.M., in the University of Dublin, having pursued his studies there under the tutorship of Dr. Young, afterwards Bishop of Clonfert, of whom he always spoke with grateful and affectionate respect. On leaving college, he pursued his studies for the Christian ministry amongst the Unitarian Dissenters, during two additional years, at Norwich, where he enjoyed and greatly valued the instructions, as he looked up with unfeigned and high respect to the example, of that accomplished scholar, lucid writer and excellent man, Dr. William Enfield. Here, too, he formed some friendships which, to the close of life, he cherished and looked back upon with pleasure and gratitude. Soon after the completion of his course of study at Norwich, he received an invitation to become the co-pastor of the Rev. Philip Taylor, minister of the Presbyterian congregation assembling in Eustace Street, Dublin. This invitation he gladly accepted, and was regularly ordained to the ministry, with the forms observed in the Presbytery of Munster, to which the congregation of Eustace Street is attached, on Good Friday, 1788. On May 26th of the same year, he was married to

Mary, daughter of John and Mary Swanwick, of Wem, Shropshire, who numbered amongst her ancestors, on the father's side, that exemplary Christian and bright ornament to the cause of Nonconforming Christianity, Philip Henry. She still survives, in her 89th year, the mother of fourteen children, of whom seven remain, to "do reverence" both to the living and the departed, and to "call them blessed." As pastor of the congregation of Eustace Street, the Rev. Joseph Hutton first entered upon his ministry; and to the faithful and diligent performance of the duties which the relation thus formed imposed upon him, all the remaining years of his long and virtuous and happy life were conscientiously devoted. Of him, as of the poet's village clergyman, it may be truly said, that he "ne'er had changed, nor wished to change, his place." With his first colleague, the Rev. Philip Taylor, he lived for many years on terms of cordial friendship and co-operation; and the respected ministers with whom he was subsequently united in the co-pastorship, the Rev. James Martineau and the Rev. Thos. Hincks, who still survive in the occupancy of other important spheres of duty, and the Rev. Dr. Ledlie, who retained his co-pastorship from the time that he entered upon it till his death, would, it is believed, have gladly testified that they always found in him a kind, unenvying, generous friend, and a hearty co-operator in every work of love. Of his flock, it may be truly said that he was, according to the measure of his power, an affectionate and faithful pastor. Of the near and dear relation which he had so long borne to them, he thought and spoke with warm interest and pleasure to the last hours of his life,—a pleasure, however, tempered with true modesty, and shaded with regret for short-comings, of which one whose standard of duty was so high, and whose humility was so sincere and deep, could not but feel conscious. Assuredly he was not one who could look back upon his course without misgivings,—without deeply feeling that even God's good children are, at the best, "but unprofitable servants," and must seek their final refuge in the pardoning mercy of Infinite Love. Of his feelings on this head he has himself left a brief but touching record for his flock. "I should feel ungrateful," says he, at the close of a short supplement to his Will, written with his own

hand, and addressed to his family, "not to bear on my mind the satisfaction which I have derived from my connection with the people of Eustace Street, as one of their pastors for many years. I entreat my God to pardon the many deficiencies of my public ministry; and, if I have been the means of spiritual good to any, to accept my humble and fervent thanks, through Jesus Christ my Lord. Amen." An elaborate delineation of this good man's character, it is neither the intention nor the wish of the present writer to attempt. "I have observed," says the worthy Bishop of Winchester, George Morley, "that 'in hujusmodi multiloquiis, aut nunquam aut raro deest peccatum,'" and he accordingly charges the executors of his Will to forbid the delivery of any "funerall sermon or panegyricall oration" at his "buryall." Not less deep is the present writer's own conviction, and it is his belief that he of whom he writes would have sympathized with him, that the all-important element of *truth* is not unfrequently wanting in such compositions. Few juster or more note-worthy sentiments have, perhaps, ever been uttered than that of the poet,—

"Who made the heart—'tis *He alone*

Decidedly can try us;

He knows each chord—its various tone,

Each string—its various bias."

Nevertheless, one or two characteristic traits, as the writer sincerely believes, of the beloved departed, he will venture to notice, with the hope that, in doing so, he may, without violating truth, do good by exciting a virtuous sympathy. And, in the first place, he would direct the attention of survivors to the strict purity of the life and conversation of the deceased. In the course of more than half a century's intimate intercourse with him, he cannot remember to have seen an act, or heard a word, by which the eye or ear of the most delicate mind could have been offended. Such purity of life and conversation, he cannot but think, must have had its source in purity of heart—that purity which we have the highest authority for believing to be one of the best and most essential preparatives for an intimate communion with God Himself. Not perhaps wholly unconnected with this excellence, was that taste for the simply beautiful in nature and art, which would seem to have been a never-failing source of pure and blame-

less enjoyment to his mind to the latest moment that it could act or feel. Never was he left without sources of heartfelt pleasure so long as the beautiful works of God Himself, or of him whom God has formed in His own image, and who can sometimes therefore work beautifully also, were spread around his path and met his quickly and nicely observant eye. His lowly estimate of self, combined, as it was, with a ready and generous appreciation of the merits of others, is a characteristic that has already been noticed, but deserves to be dwelt upon. The claim, it may be remarked, which age may justly put forth, and which youth should never fail to acknowledge, to respectful deference, though quick to feel, and modestly grateful when others recognized it in their conduct towards him, he was never eager or jealous to exact. The youthful candidate for notice or honour always found in him a patient and indulgent hearer and judge; and, in his estimate of others' excellence, the consideration of his own power to equal or surpass it never seemed to form an element. No shade of jealousy darkened or even dimmed his admiration of what was truly admirable, either in his contemporaries or his juniors. It has been justly observed also, by one who knew and loved him well, that with great quickness in detecting the failings of his associates, it was his general habit to combine, where good could not obviously be effected by their exposure, a good-natured silence respecting them. Once more, those who loved him cannot recollect without tender respect the manner in which he endured,—not indeed the sufferings, for, through the mercy of God, he was not a sufferer,—but the irksomeness and privations of his gradual decline; the uncomplaining submission, the quiet cheerfulness with which he bowed to the will of his God and Father, giving utterance to no needless complaints, dwelling always on what seemed bright and happy in his lot, and consulting always, with thoughtful and quickly observant courtesy, the feelings of all around him,—of superiors, equals and inferiors alike,—of the domestics attendant upon him, not less than of any of the other members of his family. As a simple and earnest preacher,—a faithful and affectionate pastor,—and, in all the relations of life, with that allowance which must be ever made for human frailty, as a truly good man, he will long be respected and loved.

J. H.

Feb. 12, at Torquay, aged 18, HENRY HUTCHISON ROBINSON, the sole surviving child of the late Thomas Henry Robinson, of Bury St. Edmunds, Esq. On the 19th of the same month, his body was interred in the vault of his mother's (the Hutchison) family in the cemetery attached to the Unitarian chapel at Hackney. The name of Mr. H. H. R. was placed among those of the Life Trustees of the Manchester New College in London, when, from his actual age, it would have been sought in a list of the pupils rather than of the guardians of that deserving institution. This was no unwarranted compliment paid to a combination of rare mental endowments with moral qualities of singular purity and earnestness. But in the present state of existence, these were frustrated by being set in a feeble frame; and he sank under the severe attack of a disease which had already lasted several years. A fresh instance of the vanity of human wishes and expectations! For his nearest friends had fondly anticipated that at a future period he would be found among the able and zealous supporters of the great cause, not of "civil and religious liberty" only, according to the ordinary phrase, but of truth and justice under the stimulus of philanthropy, for the sake of which only liberty is desirable, and without which the pursuit of it is but a form of idolatry.

March 3, EMMA, wife of Mr. James BRADSHAW, Jun., of Merridale villa, Wolverhampton, and daughter of John Caister, Esq., of Boston, in Lincolnshire.

March 5, in the 10th year of her age, ANNIE, youngest daughter of the Rev. Dr. BEARD.

March 10, at Ashburnham Grove, Greenwich, Miss CAROLINE AMELIA, second daughter of John Geere JONES, Esq., and niece of Mr. Alderman Brent, of Canterbury. She was a consistent member of the Unitarian Baptist church at Deptford, and was a firm believer in Unitarian Christianity. She was a person of meek and gentle spirit, kind and courteous towards all. She lived the Christian life, and as a Christian she died.

March 12, MARIA, the wife of Rev. J. S. RAGLAND, of Hindley, aged 73 years.